Freeney V. 10. p.: 261

2-98-1 Bibl: Casanat. V. 1. p. 677

– ob: 1723

Saxii Onom: V. 6. p. 161

Walchius Bibl Theol. V3 p 670

Bwgr. Britann n. at. 1680 ob 1723

2962

296 62

Origines Eccleſiaſticæ:

OR, THE

ANTIQUITIES

OF THE

Chriſtian Church.

VOL. I.

In TWO BOOKS.

Whereof the Firſt treats of Chriſtians in general; their ſeveral Names, Diſtinctions, and Degrees of *Catechumens*, Laity, and Clergy.

And the Second gives a particular Account of the ſeveral Superior Orders and Offices of the Clergy in the Primitive Church.

The Second Edition, Corrected.

By *JOSEPH BINGHAM*,
Rector of *Headborn-Worthy* near *Wincheſter*, and ſometime Fellow of *Univerſity* Col. *Oxon.*

LONDON:
Printed for *Robert Knaplock*, at the Biſhop's-Head in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCCX.



TO THE

Right Reverend Father in God,

JONATHAN.

Lord Biſhop of *WINCHESTER*:

And Prelate of the moſt Noble Order of the GARTER.

My Lord,

HAving once determined with my ſelf to make theſe Collections Publick, I needed no long time to conſider, to whom I ſhould firſt Addreſs and Preſent them. They are, my Lord, the Firſt Fruits of my Labour under Your Lordſhip's Government and Inſpection: And I was willing to think, and do preſume I did not think amiſs, that Your Lordſhip had a ſort of Title to the

Firſt Fruits of any of Your Clergies Labour; eſpecially if the Subject, on which they were employed, was ſuitable to their Calling, and had any direct Tendency to promote Chriſtian Knowledge in the World. The Subject of the preſent Diſcourſe, being an Eſſay upon the ancient Uſages and Cuſtoms of the Primitive Church, and a particular Account of the State of her Clergy, is ſuch, as being conſidered barely in its own Nature, I know cannot but be approved by a Perſon of Your Lordſhip's Character; whoſe Care is concerned not only in Preſerving the Purity of the Primitive Faith, but alſo in Reviving the Spirit of the Ancient Diſcipline and Primitive Practice: And were the Management any ways anſwerable to the Greatneſs of the Subject, That would doubly recommend it to Your Lordſhip's Favour; ſince Apples of Gold are ſomething the more beautiful for being ſet in Pictures of Silver. But I am ſenſible the Subject is too Sublime and Copious, too Nice and Difficult, to have Juſtice done it from any ſingle Hand, much leſs from mine: All therefore I can pretend to hope for from Your Lordſhip, is, That Your Candour and Goodneſs will make juſt Allowances for the Failings, which Your Sagacity and Quickneſs will eaſily perceive to be in this Performance. I am not, I confeſs, without Hopes,

Hopes, that as well the Abſtruſeneſs and Difficulty of the Subject it ſelf, as my own Difficult Circumſtances, under which I was forced to labour, for want of proper Aſſiſtance of abundance of Books, may be ſome Apology for the Defects of the Work: And if I can but ſo far obtain Your Lordſhip's Good Opinion, as to be thought to have deſigned well; as I am already conſcious of my own good Intentions to conſecrate all my Labours to the Publick Service of the Church; that will inſpire me with Freſh Vigour, notwithſtanding theſe Difficulties, to proceed with Cheerfulneſs and Alacrity in the remaining Parts of this Work, which are yet behind, and which I ſhall be the more willing to ſet about, if I can perceive that it has Your Lordſhip's Approbation. The Countenance and Encouragement of ſuch a Judge may perhaps have a more Univerſal Influence, to excite the Zeal of many others, who have greater Abilities to ſerve the Church: And I know not how better to congratulate Your Lordſhip upon Your Happy Acceſſion to the Epiſcopal Throne of this Dioceſe, than by wiſhing You the Bleſſing and Satisfaction of ſuch a Clergy, whoſe Learning and Induſtry, and Piety and Religion, Influenced by the Wiſdom of Your Conduct, and Animated by the Example of Your Zeal and Perſeverance, even to Impriſonment in Times of greateſt Difficulty, may ſo qualify them to diſcharge every Office

of their Function, as may make Your Dioceſe one of the ſhining Glories of the Preſent Church, and a provoking Example to the Future: Which is the hearty Prayer and Deſire of,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's Faithful

and Obedient Servant,

J. Bingham.

THE

THE

PREFACE.

THis Volume, which is now publiſhed, being only a Part of a larger Work, the Reader, I preſume, will expect I ſhould give him ſome little Account of the whole Deſign, and the Reaſons which engaged me upon this Undertaking. The Deſign which I have formed to my ſelf, is to give ſuch a Methodical Account of the Antiquities of the Chriſtian Church, as others have done of the Greek, *and* Roman, *and* Jewiſh *Antiquities; not by writing an Hiſtorical, or continued Chronological Account of all Tranſactions as they happened in the Church, (of which kind of Books there is no great want) but by reducing the ancient Cuſtoms, Uſages and Practices of the Church under certain proper Heads, whereby the Reader may take a View at once of any particular Uſage or Cuſtom of Chriſtians, for Four or Five of the firſt Centuries, to which I have generally confined my Enquiries in this Diſcourſe. I cannot but own, I was moved with a ſort of Emulation (not an Unholy one, I hope) to ſee ſo many Learned Men with ſo much Zeal employed in Collecting and Publiſhing the Antiquities of* Greece *and* Rome; *whilſt in the mean time we had Nothing (ſo far as I was able to learn) that could be called a Compleat Collection of the Antiquities of the Church, in the Method that is now propoſed. The Compilers of Church-Hiſtory*

indeed have taken Notice of many Things of this kind, as they paſs along in the Courſe of their Hiſtory, as Baronius, *and the* Centuriators, *and ſeveral others: But then the things lie ſcattered in ſo many Places in large Volumes, that there are few Readers of thoſe few that enter upon Reading thoſe Books, that will be at the Pains to Collect their Accounts of Things into one View, or Digeſt and Methodize their ſcattered Obſervations. There are a great many other Authors, who have written ſeveral Excellent Diſcourſes upon particular Subjects of Church-Antiquity, out of which perhaps a* Gronovius *or a* Græ-vius *might make a more Noble Collection of Antiquities, than any yet Extant in the World: But as no One has yet attempted ſuch a Work, ſo neither when it was effected, would it be for the Purchaſe or Peruſal of every Ordinary Reader, for whoſe Uſe chiefly my own Collections are intended. There are a third Sort of Writers, who have alſo done very good Service in Explaining and Illuſtrating ſeveral Parts of Church-Antiquity in their Occaſional Notes and Obſervations upon many of the Ancient Writers; of which kind are the curious Obſervations of* Albaſpiny, Juſtellus, Petavius, Valeſius, Cotelerius, Baluzius, Sirmondus, Gothofred, Fabrotus, *Biſhop* Beverege, *and many others, who have publiſhed the Works of the Ancient Fathers, and Canons of the Councils, with very Excellent and Judicious Remarks upon them. But theſe again lie ſcattered in ſo many and ſo large Volumes, without any other Order, than as the Authors on whom they commented, would admit of, that they are not to be reckoned upon, or uſed as any Methodized or Digeſted Collection of Church-Antiquities, even by thoſe who have Ability to Purchaſe; or Opportunity to Read them. Beſides theſe there are another ſort of Writers, who have purpoſely undertaken to give an Account of the ancient Uſages of the Church, in Treatiſes written particularly upon that Subject; ſuch as* Gavantus, Caſalius, Durantus, *and ſeveral others of the* Roman

Con-

Communion: But these Writers do by no means satisfy a Judicious and Inquisitive Reader, for several Reasons: 1. *Because their Accounts are very Imperfect, being confined chiefly to the Liturgical Part of Church-Antiquity, beside which there are a great many other things necessary to be explained, which they do not so much as touch upon, or once mention.* 2. *Because in treating of that Part they build much upon the Collections of* Gratian, *and such Modern Writers, and use the Authority of the spurious Epistles of the ancient Popes, which have been Exploded long ago, as having no Pretence to Antiquity in the Judgment of all Candid and Judicious Writers. But chiefly their Accounts are unsatisfactory, because,* 3. *Their whole Design is to varnish over the Novel Practices of the* Romish *Church, and put a Face of Antiquity upon them: To which purpose they many times represent ancient Customs in Disguise, to make them look like the Practices of the present Age, and offer them to the Readers View not in their own Native Dress, but in the Similitude and Resemblance of Modern Customs.* Cardinal Bona *himself could not forbear making this Reflection upon some such Writers as these, whom he justly censures, as deserving very ill* * *of the Sacred Rites of the Church, and their venerable Antiquity, who measure all ancient Customs by the Practice of the present Times, and judge of the Primitive Discipline only by the Rule and Customs of the Age they live in; being deceived by a false Persuasion, that the Practice of the Church never differed in any Point from the Customs which they learned from their Forefathers and Teachers, and which they have been inured to from their tender Years: Whereas we retain many words in common with the ancient Fathers, but in a Sense as different from theirs, as our Times are remote from the first Ages after Christ; as will appear (says he) when we come to discourse of the Oblation, Communion, and other Parts of Divine Service.*

* Bona Rerum Liturgic. Lib. 1. c. 18. n. 1.

vice. This is an Ingenuous Confeſſion, and withal a juſt Reflection upon the Partiality of the Writers of his own Church; and a good Reaſon in my Opinion why we are not to expect any exact Accounts of Antiquity from any Writers of that Communion; though ſome are leſs tainted with her Errors than others, and can allow themſelves to be a little more Liberal and Free upon ſome Occaſions than the reſt of their Brethren: Yet even Bona *himſelf, after the Reflection he has made upon others, runs into the very ſame Error, and falls under his own Cenſure: And* Habertus, *though otherwiſe a very Learned and Ingenuous Perſon, who has written about the* Greek *Liturgicks, as* Bona *has of the* Latin; *is often through Prejudice carried away with the common Failing of the Writers of that ſide, whoſe Talents are chiefly employed in Palliating the Faults of the Communion and Cauſe they are engaged in. So that if we are to expect any exact Account of Church-Antiquities, it muſt be from ſome* Proteſtant *Authors, who can write with greater Freedom and leſs Prejudice concerning the Uſages and Cuſtoms of the Primitive Church. But among theſe there are very few that have travelled very far in this way; the Generality of our Writers contenting themſelves to collect and explain ſo much of Church-Antiquity, as was neceſſary to ſhew the Errors and Novelties of Popery; but not deſcending to any more Minute and Particular Conſideration of things, which did not come within the Compaſs of the Controverſy they had with the* Romiſh *Church.* Hoſpinian *indeed in the Beginning of the Reformation, wrote ſeveral large Volumes of the Origin of Temples, Feſtivals, Monachiſm, with the Hiſtory of the Euchariſt. But as theſe take in but very few Subjects, ſo they are too full of Modern Relations; which make them ſomething tedious to an ordinary Reader, and no compleat Account of Primitive Cuſtoms neither.* Spalatenſis *in his Books de* Republica Eccleſiaſtica *has gone a little farther; yet he generally confines himſelf to the Popiſh Controverſy, and has much out of* Gratian *and the Canon Law; which*

indeed

indeed ſerved him as good Argument ad Hominem *againſt thoſe whom he had to deal with, but it will not paſs for Authentick Hiſtory in other Caſes.* Suicerus *his* Theſaurus Eccleſiaſticus *is abundantly more Particular, and indeed the beſt Treaſure of this ſort of Learning, that has yet been publiſhed: But his Collections are chiefly out of the* Greek *Fathers; and only in the Method of a Vocabulary or Lexicon, explaining Words and Things preciſely in the Order of the Alphabet. The moſt Methodical Account of things of this kind, that I have yet ſeen, is that of our Learned Countryman Dr.* Cave, *in his Excellent Book of* Primitive Chriſtianity; *wherein he has given a Succinct, but clear Account of many Ancient Cuſtoms and Practices, not ordinarily to be met with elſewhere. But his Deſign being chiefly to recommend the Moral Part of Primitive Chriſtianity to the Obſervation and Practice of Men, he was not oblig'd to be very particular in explaining many other things, which though uſeful in themſelves, yet might be looked upon as foreign to his Deſign; and for that reaſon, I preſume, he induſtriouſly omitted them. There are ſome other Books, which I have not yet ſeen, but only gueſs by the Titles that they may be of this kind; ſuch as* Bebelius's Antiquitates Eccleſiaſticæ, Martinay de Ritibus Eccleſiæ, Hendecius de Antiquitatibus Eccleſiaſticis, Quenſtedt Antiquitates Biblicæ & Eccleſiaſticæ: *But I preſume, whatever they are, they will not foreſtall my Deſign, which is chiefly to gratify the* Engliſh *Reader with an entire Collection of Church-Antiquities in our own Language, of which this Volume is publiſhed as a Specimen. And if this proves uſeful to the Publick, and finds a favourable Acceptance, it will be followed with the remaining Parts of the Work (as my Time and Occaſions will give me leave) according to the Scheme here laid down, or with as little Variation as may be. I ſhall next treat of the Inferior Orders of the Clergy, as I have here done of the Superior: Then of the Elections and Ordinations of the Clergy, and the ſeveral Qualifica-*

tions

tions of those that were to be ordained: Of the Privileges, Immunities, and Revenues of the Clergy, and the several Laws and Rules which particularly respected their Function. To which I shall subjoin an Account of the ancient Asceticks, Monks, Virgins and Widows, who were a sort of Retainers to the Church. After this shall follow an Account of the ancient Churches, and their several Parts, Utensils, Consecrations, Immunities, together with a Notitia *of the ancient Division of the Church into Provinces, Dioceses, Parishes, and the Original of these. After which I shall speak of the Service of the Church, beginning with the Institution and Instruction of the Catechumens, and describing their several Stages before Baptism; then speak of Baptism it self, and its ordinary Concomitant, Confirmation. Then proceed to the other solemn Services of Psalmody, Reading of the Scripture, and Preaching, which were the first Part of the ancient Church-Service: Then speak of their Prayers, and the several Rites and Customs observed therein; where of the Use of Liturgies and the Lord's Prayer; and of the Prayers of Catechumens, Energumens and Penitents; all which part of the Service thus far was commonly called by the Name of the* Missa Catechumenorum; *then of the* Missa Fidelium, *or Communion-Service; where of the Manner of their Oblations and Celebration of the Eucharist, which was always the Close of the ordinary Church Service. After this I shall proceed to give a particular Account of their Fasts, and Festivals, their Marriage Rites, and Funeral Rites, and the Exercise of ancient Church Discipline; their Manner of holding Councils and Synods, Provincial, Patriarchal, Oecumenical; the Power of Christian Princes in Councils, and out of them: The Manner and Use of their* Literæ Formatæ, *and the several Sorts of them: Their different ways of Computation of Time: To which I shall add an Account of their Schools, Libraries, and Methods of Educating and training up Persons for the Ministry, and say something of the several Translations of the* Bible *in use among them,*

them, and ſeveral other Miſcellaneous Rites and Things, which would properly come under none of the forementioned Heads; ſuch as their Manner of taking Oaths, their Abſtinence from Blood, their frequent Uſe of the Sign of the Croſs, their ſeveral ſorts of Publick Charities, the Honours which they paid to their Martyrs, together with an Account of their Sufferings, and the ſeveral Inſtruments of Cruelty uſed by the Heathen to haraſs and torment them. In treating of all which, or any other ſuch-like Matters, as ſhall offer themſelves, I ſhall obſerve the ſame Method that I have done in this Volume; illuſtrating the ancient Cuſtoms from the Original Records of Antiquity, and joining the Opinions of the beſt Modern Authors that I can have Opportunity to peruſe, for unfolding Points of greateſt Difficulty. I confeſs, indeed, this Work will ſuffer ſomething in my Hands, for want of ſeveral Books, which I have no Opportunity to ſee, nor Ability to purchaſe: But that perhaps may tempt ſome others, who are at the Fountains of Learning, and have all manner of Books at Command, to add to my Labours, and improve this Eſſay to a much greater Perfection; ſince it is a Subject that will never be exhauſted, but ſtill be capable of Additions and Improvement. The chief Aſſiſtance I have hitherto had, is from the Noble Benefaction of one, who being dead, yet ſpeaketh; *I mean the Renowned Biſhop* Morley, *whoſe Memory will for ever remain freſh in the Hearts of the Learned and the Good; who, among many other Eminent Works of Charity and Generoſity, becoming his Great Soul, and High Station in the Church; ſuch as the Augmentation of ſeveral ſmall Benefices, and Proviſion of a Decent Habitation and Maintenance for the Widows of Poor Clergymen in his Dioceſe, &c. has alſo bequeathed a very valuable Collection of Books to the Church of* Wincheſter, *for the Advancement of Learning among the Parochial Clergy: And I reckon it none of the leaſt Part of my Happineſs, that Providence removing me early from the Univerſity, (where the beſt Supplies of*

Learn-

Learning are to be had) placed me by the Hands of a Generous Benefactor, without any Importunity or Seeking of my own, in such a Station, as gives me Liberty and Opportunity to make use of so good a Library, tho' not so perfect as I could wish. But the very mentioning this, as it is but a just Debt to the Memory of that Great Prelate, so perhaps it may provoke some other Generous Spirit, of like Abilities and Fortune with him, to add new Supplies of Modern Books published since his Death, to augment and compleat his Benefaction. Which would be an Addition of new Succours and Auxiliaries to my self, and others in my Circumstances, and better enable us to serve the Publick. In the mean time, the Reader may with Ease enjoy, what with no small Pains and Industry I have collected and put together; and he may make Additions from his own Reading and Observation, as I have done upon several Authors, whom I have had occasion to peruse and mention. From some of which, and those of great Fame and Learning, I have sometimes thought my self obliged to dissent, upon some nice and peculiar Questions: But I have never done it, without giving my Reasons, and treating them with that Decency and Respect, which is due to their great Learning and Character. If in any thing I have made Mistakes of my own, (as I cannot be so vain as to think I have made none) every Intelligent Reader may make himself Judge, and correct them with Ingenuity and Candor. All I can say, is, That I have been as careful to avoid Mistakes as I could, in so Critical and Curious a Subject; and I hope there will not be found so many, but that this Essay *may prove Useful both to the Learned and Unlearned; to instruct the one, who cannot read these Things in their Originals; and refresh the Memories of the other, who may know many things, that they cannot always readily have recourse to. Or, if it be of no use to greater Proficients, it may at least be some Help to*

Dr. Radcliffe.

Young

Young Students and New Beginners, and both provoke them to the Study of Ancient Learning, and a little prepare them for their Entrance upon it. Besides, I considered, there were some who might have a good Inclination toward the Study of these things, who yet have neither Ability to purchase, nor Time and Opportunity to read over many Ancient Fathers and Councils: And to such, a Work of this Nature composed ready to their Hands, might be of considerable Use, to acquaint them with the State and Practice of the Primitive Church, when they have no better Opportunities to be informed about it. If in any of these Respects, these Collections (which were designed for the Honour of the Ancient Church, and the Benefit of the Present,) may prove serviceable toward those Ends, I shall not think my Time and Pains ill bestowed.

THE

The Contents.

BOOK I.

Of the ſeveral Names and Orders of Men in the Chriſtian Church.

CHAP. I.

Of thoſe Titles and Appellations which Chriſtians owned, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves by.

Sect. 1. *Chriſtians at firſt called* Jeſſeans, Therapeutæ, Electi, *&c.* Sect. 2. *Chriſt called by a Technical Name* ΙΧΘΥΣ; *and Chriſtians,* Piſciculi, *from that.* Sect. 3. *Chriſtians, why called* Gnoſtici *by ſome Authors.* Sect. 4. Theophori, *and* Chriſtophori. Sect. 5. *Sometimes, but very rarely,* Chriſti. Sect. 6. *Chriſtians great Enemies to all Party-Names, and Human Appellations.* Chriſtian, *the Name they chiefly gloried in.* Sect. 7. *Of the Name* Catholick, *and its Antiquity.* Sect. 8. *In what Senſe the Name* Eccleſiaſticks *given to all Chriſtians.* Sect. 9. *The Chriſtian Religion called* Δόγμα, *and Chriſtians* οἱ τῶ Δόγμα. Sect. 10. *Chriſtians called* Jews *by the* Heathen. Sect. 11. *Chriſt commonly called* Chreſtus *by the* Heathen; *and Chriſtians,* Chreſtians. Pag. 1

CHAP. II.

Of thoſe Names of Reproach, which Jews, Infidels, and Hereticks caſt upon the Chriſtians.

Sect. 1. *Chriſtians commonly called* Nazarens *by* Jews *and* Heathens. Sect. 2. *And* Galilæans. Sect. 3. *And*

And Atheiſts. Sect. 4. Greeks *and Impoſtors.* Sect. 5. *Magicians.* Sect. 6. *The New Superſtition.* Sect. 7. Sibylliſts. Sect. 8. Biothanati. Sect. 9. Paraboları, *and* Deſperati. Sect. 10. Sarmentitii, *and* Semaxii. Sect. 11. Luciſugax Natio. Sect. 12. Plautina Proſapia. Sect. 13. *Chriſtians called* Capitolins, Synedrians, *and* Apoſtaticks, *by the* Novatians. Sect. 14. Pſychici, *by the* Montaniſts *and* Valentinians. Sect. 15. Allegoriſts *by the* Millenaries. Sect. 16. Chronitæ *by the* Aetians, Simplices *by the* Manichees, Anthropolatræ *by the* Apollinarians. Sect. 17. Philoſarchæ, *and* Peluſiotæ *by the* Origenians. Sect. 18. *The Synagogue of* Satan *and* Antichriſt, *by the* Luciferians. p. 13

CHAP. III.

Of the ſeveral Orders of Men in the Chriſtian Church.

Sect. 1. *Three ſorts of Members of the Chriſtian Church; the* ἡγέμονοι, πιστοί, *and* κατηχούμενοι; *Rulers, Believers, and Catechumens.* Sect. 2. *The Name,* Believers, *ſtrictly taken for the Baptized Laity, in Oppoſition to the Catechumens.* Sect. 3. *Catechumens owned as Imperfect Members of the Church.* Sect. 4. *Hereticks not reputed Chriſtians.* Sect. 5. *Penitents and* Energumens *ranked in the ſame Claſs with* Catechumens. p. 27

CHAP. IV.

A more particular Account of the πιστοί, or Believers, and their ſeveral Titles of Honour, and Privileges above the Catechumens.

Sect. 1. *Believers otherwiſe called* φωτιζόμενοι, *The Illuminate.* Sect. 2. *And* οἱ μεμυημένοι, *The Initiated.* Sect. 3. *And* τέλειοι, *The Perfect.* Sect. 4. Chari Dei, ἅγιοι, &c. Sect. 5. *The Privileges of Believers.* Firſt, *To partake of the Euchariſt.* Sect. 6. Secondly, *To ſtay and join in all the Prayers of the Church.*

Church. Sect. 7. Thirdly, *Their ſole Prerogative to uſe the Lord's-Prayer. Whence that Prayer was called* εὐχὴ πιστῶν, *the Prayer of Believers.* Sect. 8. Fourthly, *They were admitted to hear Diſcourſes upon the moſt Profound Myſteries of Religion. All which Privileges were denied to the Catechumens.* p. 32

CHAP. V.

Of the Diſtinction of Believers from the Rulers. Where, of the Diſtinction obſerved in the Names and Offices of Laity and Clergy; and of the Antiquity of theſe Diſtinctions.

Sect. 1. *Believers otherwiſe called* Laici, *Laymen, to diſtinguiſh them from the Clergy.* Sect. 2. *The Antiquity of this Diſtinction in the Names, proved againſt* Rigaltius, Salmaſius, *and* Selden. Sect. 3. *The Objection from* 1 Pet. 5. 3. *anſwered.* Sect. 4. *A Diſtinction in the Offices of Laity and Clergy always obſerved.* Sect. 5. *Laymen otherwiſe called* βιωτικοὶ, *Seculars.* Sect. 6. *Alſo* ἰδιῶται, *Private Men.* Sect. 7. *What Perſons properly called* Clerici. Sect. 8. *The Name* Clerici, *ſometimes appropriated to the Inferior Orders.* Sect. 9. *The Reaſon of the Name* Clerici. Sect. 10. *All the Clergy anciently called* Canonici; *and the Reaſon of it.* Sect. 11. *Alſo* τάξις τοῦ θήματος, *The Order of the Sanctuary.* p. 38

BOOK II.

Of the ſeveral Superior Orders of the Clergy in the Primitive Church.

CHAP. I.

Of the Original of Biſhops; and that they were a diſtinct Order from Presbyters in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 1. *What the Ancients mean by different Orders of Biſhops and Presbyters.* Sect. 2. *The Order of Biſhops*

always owned to be ſuperior to that of Presbyters. Sect. 3. *The Order of Biſhops reckon'd by all Ancient Writers to be of Apoſtolical and Divine Inſtitution.* Sect. 4. *A Liſt or Catalogue of Biſhops Ordained by the Apoſtles.* p. 49

CHAP. II.

Of the ſeveral Titles of Honour given to Biſhops in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 1. *All Biſhops at firſt called Apoſtles.* Sect. 2. *After that, Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.* Sect. 3. *Whence every Biſhop's See called* Sedes Apoſtolica. Sect. 4. *Biſhops called Princes of the People.* Sect. 5. Præpoſiti, προεστῶτες, πρόεδροι, ἔφοροι. Sect. 6. Principes Sacerdotum, Summi Sacerdotes, Pontifices Maximi, *&c.* Sect. 7. *Every Biſhop anciently called* Papa, *Father, or Pope.* Sect. 8. Pater Patrum, *and* Epiſcopus Epiſcoporum ; *a Title given to others beſide the Biſhop of* Rome. Sect. 9. *Biſhops ſometimes called Patriarchs.* Sect. 10. *All Biſhops ſtiled Vicars of Chriſt.* Sect. 11. *And Angels of the Churches.* p. 63

CHAP. III.

Of the Offices of Biſhops, as diſtinct from Presbyters.

Sect. 1. *A Threefold Difference between Biſhops and Presbyters, in the Diſcharge of their Office and Function.* Sect. 2. Firſt, *In the common Offices that might be performed by both ; the Biſhop acted by an Independent Power, but Presbyters in Dependance upon, and Subordination to him.* Sect. 3. *This ſpecify'd in the Offices of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper.* Sect. 4. *And in the Office of Preaching.* Sect. 5. Secondly, *Some Offices never intruſted in the Hands of Presbyters ; ſuch as the Office and Power of Ordination.* Sect. 6. *Inſtances of Ordinations by Presbyters diſanulled by the Church.* Sect. 7. *Some Allegations to the contrary Examined. Where, of the Difference made between the Ordinations*

of

of Schismatical Bishops, and those of mere Presbyters. Sect. 8. *A* Third *Difference between Bishops and Presbyters, was, That Presbyters were always accountable to their Bishops; not Bishops to their Presbyters.* Sect. 9. *Yet Bishops Power not arbitrary, but limited by Canon in various Respects.* p. 76

CHAP. IV.

Of the Power of Bishops over the Laity, Monks, Subordinate Magistrates, and all Persons within their Diocese: And of their Office in Disposing of the Revenues of the Church.

Sect. 1. *No Exemption from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop in the Primitive Church.* Sect. 2. *All Monks subject to the Bishop of the Diocese where they lived.* Sect. 3. *As also all Subordinate Magistrates in Matters of Spiritual Jurisdiction.* Sect. 4. *Of the Distinction between Temporal and Spiritual Jurisdiction. Bishops Power wholly confined to the latter.* Sect. 5. *The Bishops Prerogative in granting the* Literæ Formatæ *to all Persons.* Sect. 6. *Of the Bishops Power in Disposing of the Revenues of the Church.* p. 91

CHAP. V.

Of the Office of Bishops, in relation to the whole Catholick Church.

Sect. 1. *In what Sense every Bishop supposed to be Bishop of the whole Catholick Church.* Sect. 2. *In what Respect the whole World but One Diocese, and but One Bishoprick in the Church.* Sect. 3. *Some particular Instances of Private Bishops acting as Bishops of the whole Universal Church.* p. 100

CHAP. VI.

Of the Independency of Bishops; especially in the *Cyprianick* Age, and in the *African* Churches.

Sect. 1. *What meant by the Independency of Bishops one*

of another, and their Abſolute Power in their own Church. Sect. 2. *All Biſhops had Liberty to form their own Liturgies.* Sect. 3. *And to expreſs the ſame Catholick Creed in different Forms, as to what concerned Method or Expreſſion.* Sect. 4. *And to appoint particular Days of Faſting in their own Churches.* Sect. 5. *The Independency of Biſhops moſt conſpicuous in the African Churches; proved by ſeveral Inſtances out of* Cyprian. p. 106

CHAP. VII.

Of the Power of Biſhops, in Hearing and Determining of Secular Cauſes.

Sect. 1. *Biſhops commonly choſen Arbitrators of Mens Differences in the Primitive Church.* Sect. 2. *The Original of this Cuſtom. Where, of the true meaning of thoſe Words in St.* Paul, τῶν ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; 1 Cor. 6. 4. Sect. 3. *This Power of Biſhops confirmed by the Imperial Laws.* Sect. 4. *Yet not allowed in Capital and Criminal Cauſes; nor in any Cauſes, but when the Litigants both agreed to take them for Arbitrators.* Sect. 5. *Biſhops ſometimes made their Presbyters and Deacons, and ſometimes Laymen their Subſtitutes in this Affair. A Conjecture about the Original of Lay-Chancellors.* p. 112

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Privilege of Biſhops to intercede for Criminals.

Sect. 1. *Several Inſtances of Biſhops interceding for Criminals to the Secular Magiſtrate.* Sect. 2. *The Reaſon why they interceded for ſome Criminals, and not others.* Sect. 3. *That they never interceded in Civil Matters, and Pecuniary Caſes.* p. 118

CHAP. IX.

Of ſome particular Honours and Inſtances of Reſpect,

ſpect, ſhewed to Biſhops by all Perſons in general.

Sect. 1. *Of the ancient Cuſtom of Bowing the Head, to receive the Benediction of Biſhops.* Sect. 2. *Of Kiſſing their Hand.* Sect. 3. *The Cuſtom of Singing* Hoſanna's *to them ſometimes uſed, but not approved.* Sect. 4. *What meant by the* Corona Sacerdotalis, *and the Form of Saluting Biſhops* per Coronam. Sect. 5. *Whether Biſhops anciently wore a Mitre?* Sect. 6. *Of the Titles* Ἁγιώτατοι, Beatiſſimi, *&c. moſt Holy and moſt Bleſſed Fathers, common to all Biſhops.* Sect. 7. *Biſhops diſtinguiſhed by their Throne in the Church.* p. 121

CHAP. X.

Of the Age, and ſome other particular Qualifications required in ſuch as were to be Ordained Biſhops.

Sect. 1. *Biſhops not to be Ordained under* 30 *Years of Age, except they were Men of extraordinary Worth.* Sect. 2. *To be choſen out of the Clergy of the ſame Church, or Dioceſe, to which they were to be Ordained.* Sect. 3. *Some Exceptions to this Rule, in Three ſpecial Caſes.* Sect. 4. *Biſhops ordinarily to be ſuch as had regularly gone through the Inferior Orders of the Church.* Sect. 5. *This to be underſtood of the Orders below that of Deacon: For Deacons were qualify'd to be Ordained Biſhops, without being made Presbyters.* Sect. 6. *In Caſes of Neceſſity, Biſhops choſen out of the Inferior Orders.* Sect. 7. *And in ſome extraordinary Caſes Ordained immediately from Laymen. The Cuſtom of going through all the Orders of the Church in Five or Six days time, a Novel Practice never uſed in the Primitive Ages.* p. 129

CHAP. XI.

Of ſome particular Laws and Cuſtoms obſerved about the Ordination of Biſhops.

Sect. 1. *Biſhopricks not to remain void above Three Months.* Sect. 2. *In ſome Places, a new Biſhop was always choſen, before the old was interr'd.* Sect. 3. *Some Inſtances of longer Vacancies, in Times of Difficulty and Perſecution.* Sect. 4. *Three Biſhops ordinarily required to a Canonical Ordination of a Biſhop.* Sect. 5. *Yet Ordinations by one Biſhop allowed to be valid, though not Canonical.* Sect. 6. *The Biſhop of* Rome *not privileged to Ordain alone, any more than any other ſingle Biſhop.* Sect. 7. *Every Biſhop to be Ordained in his own Church.* Sect. 8. *The ancient Manner of Ordaining Biſhops.* Sect. 9. *One of the Forms of Prayer uſed at their Conſecration.* Sect. 10. *Of their Enthronement; their* Homiliæ Enthroniſticæ, *and* Literæ Enthroniſticæ, *otherwiſe called* Synodicæ, *and* Communicatoriæ. p. 140

CHAP. XII.

Of the Rule which prohibits Biſhops to be Ordained in ſmall Cities and Villages.

Sect. 1. *The Reaſon of the Law againſt placing Biſhops in ſmall Cities.* Sect. 2. *Some Exceptions to this Rule in* Egypt, Libya, Cyprus, Arabia, *and eſpecially in the Provinces of* Aſia Minor. Sect. 3. *Reaſons which engaged the Ancients ſometimes to erect Biſhopricks in ſmall Places.* p. 154

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Rule which forbids Two Biſhops to be Ordained in one City.

Sect. 1. *The general Rule and Practice of the Church to have but one Biſhop in any City.* Sect. 2. *Yet Two Biſhops ſometimes allowed by Compromiſe to end a Diſpute, or cure an Inveterate Schiſm. Where of the Famous Offer made by the Catholick Biſhops to the* Donatiſts *in the Collation of* Carthage. Sect. 3. *The Opinions of Learned Men concerning Two Biſhops in a City in the Apo-*

Apostolical Age, one of the Jews, *and the other of the* Gentiles. Sect. 4. *The Case of Coadjutors.* p. 160

CHAP. XIV.

Of the *Chorepiscopi*, Περιοδευται, and Suffragan Bishops: and how these differed from one another.

Sect. 1. *Of the Reason of the Name* Chorepiscopi, *and the Mistake of some about it.* Sect. 2. *Three different Opinions about the Nature of this Order. The first Opinion, that they were mere Presbyters.* Sect. 3. *The 2d Opinion, that some of them were Presbyters, and some Bishops.* Sect. 4. *The 3d Opinion most probable, that they were all Bishops.* Sect. 5. *Some Objections against this answered.* Sect. 6. *Of the Offices of the* Chorepiscopi. *First, they were allowed to ordain the Inferior Clergy, Subdeacons, Readers,* &c. *but not Presbyters or Deacons, without special License from the City-Bishop.* Sect. 7. *Secondly, they had Power to minister Confirmation.* Sect. 8. *Thirdly, Power to grant Letters Dimissory to the Country-Clergy.* Sect. 9. *Fourthly, they might officiate in the Presence of the City-Bishop.* Sect. 10. *Fifthly, they might sit as Bishops, and vote in Council.* Sect. 11. *The Power of the* Chorepiscopi *not the same in all Times and Places.* Sect. 12. *Their Power first struck at by the Council of* Laodicea, *which set up* Περιοδευται, *or Visiting Presbyters in their room. Their Power wholly taken away in the* Western *Church in the 9th Century.* Sect. 13. *Of the Attempt made in* England *to restore this Order under the Name of Suffragan Bishops.* Sect. 14. *That Suffragan Bishops in the Primitive Church were not the* Chorepiscopi, *but all the Bishops in any Province under a Metropolitan.* Sect. 15. *Why the Suffragan Bishops of the* Roman *Province were particularly called by the Technical Name,* Libra. p. 170

CHAP. XV.

Of the *Interceſſores* and *Interventores* in the *African* Churches.

Sect. 1. *The Reaſon why ſome Biſhops were called by theſe Names in the* African Church, *and what their Office was.* Sect. 2. *Their Office not to laſt above one Year.* Sect. 3. *No Interceſſor to be made Biſhop of the Place where he was conſtituted Interceſſor.* p. 181

CHAP. XVI.

Of Primates or Metropolitans.

Sect. 1. *The Original of Metropolitans, by ſome derived from Apoſtolical Conſtitution.* Sect. 2. *By others from the Age next after the Apoſtles.* Sect. 3. *Confeſſed by all to have been long before the Council of* Nice. Sect. 4. *Proofs of Metropolitans in the 2d Century.* Sect. 5. *By what Names Metropolitans were anciently called.* Sect. 6. *In* Africk *they were commonly called,* Senes, *becauſe the eldeſt Biſhop of the Province (excepting the Province where* Carthage *ſtood) was always the Metropolitan by Virtue of his Seniority.* Sect. 7. *How the* African *Biſhops might forfeit their Title to the Primacy, and loſe their Right of Seniority.* Sect. 8. *A Regiſter of Ordinations to be kept in the Primate's Church, and all Biſhops to take place by Seniority, that there might be no Diſputes about the Primacy.* Sect. 9. *Three ſorts of Honorary Metropolitans beſide the Metropolitans in Power. Firſt, the Primates Ævo.* Sect. 10. *Secondly, Titular Metropolitans.* Sect. 11. *Thirdly, the Biſhops of ſome Mother-Churches, which were honoured by Ancient Cuſtom.* Sect. 12. *The Offices of Metropolitans. Firſt to ordain their Suffragan Biſhops.* Sect. 13. *This Power continued to them after the ſetting up of Patriarchs in all Places, except in the Patriarchate of* Alexandria. Sect. 14. *The Power of Metropolitans not Arbitrary in this reſpect, but to be concluded*

cluded by the Major Vote of a Provincial Council. Sect. 15. *Metropolitans themſelves to be choſen and ordained by their own Provincial Synod, and not obliged to go to* Rome *for Ordination.* Sect. 16. *The 2d Office of Metropolitans, To decide Controverſies ariſing among their Provincial Biſhops, and to take Appeals from them.* Sect. 17. *Their third Office was to call Provincial Synods, which all their Suffragans were obliged to attend.* Sect. 18. *Furthly, they were to publiſh ſuch Imperial Laws as concerned the Church, together with the Canons that were made in Councils, and to ſee them executed; for which end they were to viſit any Dioceſe, and correct Abuſes, as occaſion required.* Sect. 19. *Fifthly, all Biſhops were obliged to have recourſe to the Metropolitans and take his* Formatæ *or Letters of Commendation, whenever they travelled into a Foreign Country.* Sect. 20. *Sixthly, it belonged to Metropolitans to take care of Vacant Sees within their Province.* Sect. 21. *Laſtly, they were to calculate the Time of* Eaſter, *and give Notice of it to the whole Province.* Sect. 22. *How the Power of Metropolitans grew in After-Ages.* Sect. 23. *The Metropolitan of* Alexandria *had the greateſt Power of any other in the World.* Sect. 24. *All Metropolitans called* Apoſtolici, *and their Sees* Sedes Apoſtolicæ, p. 182

CHAP. XVII.

Of Patriarchs.

Sect. 1. *Patriarchs anciently called Archbiſhops.* Sect. 2. *And Exarchs of the Dioceſe.* Sect. 3. Salmaſius's *Miſtake about the firſt Uſe of the Name Patriarch.* Sect. 4. *Of the* Jewiſh *Patriarchs, their firſt Riſe, Duration, and Extinction.* Sect. 5. *Of the Patriarchs amongſt the* Montaniſts. Sect. 6. *The Name Patriarch firſt uſed in the proper Senſe by* Socrates *and the Council of* Chalcedon. Sect. 7. *Four different Opinions concerning the firſt Riſe of Patriarchal Power.* Sect. 8.

Sect. 8. *The* Opinion *of* Spalatensis *and St.* Jerom *preferred. Some probable Proofs of Patriarchal Power before the Council of* Nice, *offered to Consideration.* Sect. 9. *Patriarchal Power confirmed in Three General Councils successively after the Council of* Nice. Sect. 10. *The Power of Patriarchs not exactly the same in all Churches. The Patriarch of* Constantinople *had some peculiar Privileges.* Sect. 11. *As also the Patriarch of* Alexandria *had his: wherein they both exceeded the Bishop of* Rome. Sect. 12. *The Powers and Privileges of Patriarchs. First, they were to ordain all the Metropolitans of the whole Diocese, and to receive their own Ordination from a Diocesan Synod.* Sect. 13. *Secondly, they were to call Diocesan Synods, and to preside in them.* Sect. 14. *Thirdly, they might receive Appeals from Metropolitans and Provincial Synods.* Sect. 15. *Fourthly, they might censure Metropolitans, and their Suffragan Bishops, if Metropolitans were remiss in Censuring them.* Sect. 16. *Fifthly, they had Power to delegate Metropolitans, as their Commissioners, to hear Ecclesiastical Causes in any Part of the Diocese.* Sect. 17. *Sixthly, they were to be consulted by their Metropolitans in all Matters of Moment. A Remarkable Instance in the* Egyptian *Bishops.* Sect. 18. *Seventhly, they were to notify and communicate to their Metropolitans such Imperial Laws as concerned the Church, in like manner as the Metropolitans were to notify to the Provincial Bishops.* Sect. 19. *Lastly the Absolution of greater Criminals was reserved to them.* Sect. 20. *The Number of Patriarchs throughout the World, reckoned to be about Fourteen, answerable to the Number of Capital Cities in the several Dioceses of the* Roman *Empire: All which at first were Absolute, and Independent of one another, till* Rome *by Usurpation, and* Constantinople *by Law, got some of their Neighbours to be subject to them.* Sect. 21. *The Patriarch of* Constantinople *commonly dignify'd with the*

the Title of Oecumenical, *and his Church called the Head of all Churches: And that he was Equal in all Respects to the Bishop of* Rome. Sect. 22. *What Figure the subordinate Patriarchs of* Ephesus *and* Cesarea *made in the Church: And that they were not mere Titular Patriarchs, as some in After-Ages.* p. 205

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Αὐτοκέφαλοι, or Independent Bishops.

Sect. 1. *All Metropolitans anciently stiled* Αὐτοκέφαλοι. Sect. 2. *Some Metropolitans Independent after the setting up of Patriarchal Power, as those of* Cyprus, Iberia, Armenia, *and the* Britannick *Church.* Sect. 3. *A third sort of* Αὐτοκέφαλοι, *such Bishops as were subject to no Metropolitan, but only to the Patriarch of the Diocese. These in the* Greek Notitia's *dignified with the Title, tho' they had not the Power of Archbishops and Metropolitans.* Sect. 4. Valesius's *Mistake corrected.* p. 228

CHAP. XIX.

Of Presbyters.

Sect. 1. *The Meaning of the Name Presbyter.* Sect. 2. *Apostles and Bishops sometimes called Presbyters.* Sect. 3. *The Original of Presbyters, as taken more strictly for the 2d Order in the Church.* Sect. 4. *The Powers and Privileges of Presbyters.* Sect. 5. *Presbyters allowed to sit with the Bishops on Thrones in the Church. Whence* ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ Θρόνῳ, *denotes a Presbyter, one that sits on the 2d Throne.* Sect. 6. *The form of their sitting in a Semicircle; Whence they were called* Corona Presbyterii. Sect. 7. *Presbyters esteemed a sort of Ecclesiastical Senate, or Council of the Church, whom the Bishop consulted and advised with upon all Occasions.* Sect. 8. *Evidences of this Prerogative out of* Ignatius, Cyprian, *and others.* Sect. 9. *The Power of Presbyters thought by some to be a little restrained in the 4th Century, and not so great in some Places as in the 2d.* Sect. 10. *Yet still they were admitted to join with the Bishop in the Imposition of Hands upon those that were*

were ordained to their own Order. Sect. 11. *And allowed to ſit in Conſiſtory with their Biſhops.* Sect. 12. *As alſo in Provincial Councils.* Sect. 13. *And in General Councils likewiſe.* Sect. 14. *An Account of the Titles of Honour given to Presbyters, and how they differed from the ſame Title as applied to Biſhops.* Sect. 15. *In what Senſe Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, called Prieſts.* Sect. 16. *Why Prieſts called Mediators between God and Men.* Sect. 17. *The Ancient Form and Manner of Ordaining Presbyters.* Sect. 18. *Of the* Archipresbyteri. *That theſe were more ancient than the* Cardinales Presbyteri, *which ſome erroneouſly confound with them.* Sect. 19. *Of the* Seniores Eccleſiæ. *That theſe were not Lay-Elders in the Modern Acceptation.* p. 232

CHAP. XX.
Of Deacons.

Sect. 1. *Deacons always reckoned one of the Sacred Orders of the Church.* Sect. 2. *Yet not generally called Prieſts, but Miniſters and* Levites. Sect. 3. *And for this Reaſon the Biſhop was not tied to have the aſſiſtance of any Presbyters to ordain them.* Sect. 4. *The firſt Office of Deacons to take care of the Veſſels and Utenſils of the Altar.* Sect. 5. *2dly, to receive the Oblations of the People, and preſent them to the Prieſt, and recite publickly the Names of thoſe that Offered.* Sect. 6. *3dly, To read the Goſpel in ſome Churches.* Sect. 7. *4thly, To miniſter the Cup to the People.* Sect. 8. *But not to conſecrate the Elements at the Altar.* Sect. 9. *5thly, Deacons allowed to baptize in ſome places by the Biſhop's Authority.* Sect. 10. *6thly, Deacons to bid Prayer in the Congregation.* Sect. 11. *7thly, allowed to preach upon ſome Occaſions.* Sect. 12 *8thly, and to reconcile Penitents in Caſes of extreme Neceſſity.* Sect. 13. *9thly, to attend their Biſhops in Councils, and ſometimes repreſent them as their Proxies.* Sect. 14. *10thly, Deacons empowered to correct*

Men

Men that behaved themſelves irregularly in the Church. Sect. 15. *Deacons anciently performed the Offices of all the Inferior Orders of the Church.* Sect. 16. 12thly, *Deacons the Biſhops Sub-Almoners.* Sect. 17. *Deacons to inform the Biſhop of the Miſdemeanors of the People.* Sect. 18. *Hence Deacons commonly called the Biſhops Eyes and Ears, his Mouth, his Angels and Prophets.* Sect. 19. *Deacons to be multiplied according to the Neceſſities of the Church. The* Roman *Church preciſe to the Number of Seven.* Sect. 20. *Of the Age at which Deacons might be ordained.* Sect. 21. *Of the Reſpect which Deacons paid to Presbyters, and received from the Inferior Orders.* p. 261

CHAP. XXI.

Of Arch-Deacons.

Sect. 1. *Arch-Deacons anciently of the ſame Order with Deacons.* Sect. 2. *Elected by the Biſhop, and not made by Seniority.* Sect. 3. *Commonly Perſons of ſuch Intereſt in the Church, that they were often choſen the Biſhops Succeſſors.* Sect. 4. *The Arch-Deacons Offices; 1ſt, to aſſiſt the Biſhop at the Altar, and order the other Deacons and Inferior Clergy to their ſeveral Stations and Services of the Church.* Sect. 5. *Secondly, to aſſiſt the Biſhop in managing the Churches Revenues.* Sect. 6. *Thirdly, to aſſiſt him in Preaching.* Sect. 7. *Fourthly, in ordaining the Inferior Clergy.* Sect. 8. *Fifthly, the Arch-Deacon had Power to cenſure the other Deacons, but not Presbyters, much leſs the Arch-Presbyter of the Church, as ſome miſtake.* Sect. 9. *What meant by the Name* Apantita, *and whether it denotes the Arch-Deacons Power over the whole Dioceſe.* Sect. 10. *Why the Arch-Deacon called* Cor-Epiſcopi. Sect. 11. *The Opinions of Learned Men concerning the firſt Inſtitution of this Office and Dignity in the Church.* p. 290

CHAP. XXII.

Of Deaconeſſes.

Sect. 1. *The ancient Names of Deaconeſſes* διάκονοι πρεσβύ-

πδις

πρεσ, Viduæ, Miniſtræ. Sect. 2. *Deaconeſſes by ſome Laws required to be Widows.* Sect. 3. *And ſuch Widows as had Children.* Sect. 4. *To be 60 Years of Age.* Sect. 5. *And ſuch as had been only the Wives of one Man.* Sect. 6. *Deaconeſſes always ordained by Impoſition of Hands.* Sect. 7. *Yet not conſecrated to any Office of the Prieſthood.* Sect. 8. *Their Offices,* 1. *To aſſiſt at the Baptiſm of Women.* Sect. 9. 2. *To be a ſort of Private Catechiſts to the Women-Catechumens.* Sect. 10. 3. *To viſit and attend Women in Sickneſs and Diſtreſs.* Sect. 11. 4. *To Miniſter to the Martyrs in Priſon.* Sect. 12. 5. *To keep the Women's-Gate in the Church.* Sect. 13. Laſtly, *To preſide over the Widows,* &c. Sect. 14. *How long this Order continued both in the* Eaſtern *and* Weſtern *Church.* Sect. 15. *Another Notion of the Name* Diaconiſſa, *in the middle Ages of the Church, in which it ſignifies a Deacon's Wife, as* Presbytera *does a Presbyter's Wife, and* Epiſcopa *a Biſhop's Wife. The contrary Errors of* Gentilletus *and* Baronius *about theſe corrected.* p. 304

THE

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE Christian Church.

BOOK I.

Of the several Names and Orders of Men in the Christian Church.

CHAP. I.

Of the several Titles and Appellations of Christians, which they owned, and distinguished themselves by.

Sect. 1. *Christians at first called* Jesseans, *and* Therapeutæ, Πιστοὶ, ἐκλεκτοὶ, &c.

WHen Christianity was first planted in the World, they who embraced it were commonly known among themselves by the Names of Disciples, Beliévers, Elect, Saints, and Brethren; before they assumed the Title and Appellation of Christians. *Epiphanius* [a] says they were also called Ἰεσσαῖοι, *Jesseans*; either from *Jesse* the Father of *David*, or, which is more probable, from the Name of the Lord *Jesus*. He adds, that *Philo* speaks of them under this Appellation, in his Book περὶ Ἰεσσαίων; which he affirms to be no other but Christians, who went by that Name in *Ægypt*, whilst

[a] Epiphan. Hær. 29. n. 4.

St. *Mark* preached the Goſpel at *Alexandria*. This Book of *Philo*'s is now extant under another Title; περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, *Of the Contemplative Life*: And ſo it is cited by *Euſebius* [*b*]; who is alſo of Opinion, that it is nothing but a Deſcription of the Chriſtians in *Egypt*, whom he calls *Therapeutæ*; which ſignifies either Worſhippers of the True God, or Spiritual Phyſicians, who undertook to cure Men's Minds of all vicious and corrupt Affections. But whether this Name was invented by *Philo*, as moſt proper to expreſs their way of living, or was then the common Name of Believers in *Ægypt*, before the Name *Chriſtian* was ſpread over all the World, *Euſebius* does not undertake to determine: However, he concludes it was a Name given to the Chriſtians; and St. *Jerom* [*c*] is ſo poſitive in it, that for this Reaſon he gives *Philo* a Place in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers; telling us, that he wrote a Book concerning the firſt Church of St. *Mark* at *Alexandria*.

Some Learned Criticks of the laſt Age, call this whole Matter [*d*] into Queſtion: But their Arguments are anſwered by others [*e*] as Learned; and therefore I ſhall enter no farther into this Diſpute, but refer the Reader, that is curious, thither for Satisfaction. That which I here take notice of farther, is only this; That theſe Names, *Therapeutæ* and *Jeſſæi*, were ſcarce ever uſed in After-Ages; but the other Names, Ἅγιοι, Πιστοὶ, Ἐκλεκτοὶ, Saints, Believers, Elect, *&c.* occur frequently in Eccleſiaſtical Writers; and ſignify not any ſelect Number of Chriſtians, (as now the Words, Saints and Elect, are often uſed to ſignify only the Predeſtinate;) but all Chriſtians in general, who were enter'd into the

[*b*] Euſeb. Hiſt. Lib. 2. c. 17. [*c*] Hieron de Scriptor. c. 21. [*d*] Scaliger & Valeſius in Euſeb, Lib. 2. c. 17. Dallæus de Jejun. & Quadrageſ. Lib. 2. c. 4. [*e*] Bevereg. Cod. Can. Vind. Lib. 3. c. 5. n. 4.

Com-

Communion of the Church by the Waters of Baptiſm. For ſo *Theodoret* (*f*) and others explain the Word Ἅγιοι, Saints, to be ſuch as were vouchſafed the Honour and Privilege of Baptiſm.

Sect. 2. *Of the Technical Names,* I X Θ Υ Σ *and* Piſciculi.

And upon this account, becauſe the Chriſtian Life took its Original from the Waters of Baptiſm, and depended upon the Obſervance of the Covenant made therein, the Chriſtians were wont to pleaſe themſelves with the Artificial Name *Piſciculi*, Fiſhes; to denote, as *Tertullian* [*g*] words it, that they were regenerate, or born again into Chriſt's Religion by Water, and could not be ſaved but by continuing therein. And this Name was the rather choſen by them, becauſe the Initial Letters of our Saviour's Names and Titles in *Greek*, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτὴρ, *Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, our Saviour*, Technically put together, make up the Name ΙΧΘΥΣ; which ſignifies a Fiſh, and is alluded to both by *Tertullian*, and [*h*] *Optatus*.

Sect. 3. *Chriſtians, why called* Gnoſtici.

Sometimes Chriſtians alſo ſtile themſelves by the Name of *Gnoſticks*, Γνωστικοὶ, Men of Underſtanding and Knowledge; becauſe the Chriſtian Religion was the trueſt Wiſdom, and the Knowledge of the moſt Divine and Heavenly things. This Name was aped and abuſed by a perverſe ſort

[*f*] Theodor. Com. in Philip. 1. 1. [*g*] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 1. Nos Piſciculi ſecundum ἰχθὺν noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum in aqua naſcimur; nec aliter quam in aqua permanendo ſalvi ſumus. [*h*] Optat. cont. Parmen. Lib. 3. p. 62. Hic eſt Piſcis qui in Baptiſmate per invocationem Fontalibus undis inſeritur, ut quæ aqua fuerat, à Piſce etiam Piſcina vocitetur. Cujus Piſcis nomen, ſecundum Appellationem Græcam in uno nomine per ſingulas Literas turbam ſanctorum nominum continet, ἰχθὺς, quod eſt latinè, Jeſus Chriſtus Dei Filius Salvator.

of Hereticks, who are commonly known and distinguished by the Name of *Gnosticks*, because of their great Pretences to Knowledge and Science falsly so called. Yet this did not hinder but that the Christians sometimes laid claim to it, as having indeed the only just and proper Right to make use of it. For which Reason, *Clemens Alexandrinus* [*i*] in all his Writings, gives the Christian Philosopher the Appellation of Γνωστικός. *Athanasius* [*k*] calls the *Asceticks* of *Ægypt*, who were of the Contemplative Life, by the same Name, Γνωστικοί: And *Socrates* tells us, *Evagrius Ponticus* wrote a Book for the Use of these *Asceticks*, which he entituled, *The Gnostick*, *i. e.* Rules for the Contemplative Life; some Fragments of which are yet extant in *Socrates* [*l*], and some others published by *Cotelerius*, in his Monuments of the *Greek* Church. In one of these Fragments, there is mention made of a Monk, who is stiled Μοναχὸς ὁ Παρεμβολῆς, τῶν Γνωστικῶν ὁ δοκιμώτατος; which the first Translators of *Socrates* not understanding, render, *A Monk of great Renown, of the Sect of the* Gnosticks; as if he had been one of the *Gnostick* Hereticks; whereas, it means no more than a Monk of the Contemplative Life, who inhabited in a Village called the *Parembole*, not far from *Alexandria*; being one of those *Asceticks*, whom *Evagrius* and all the rest call by the then known Name of Christian *Gnosticks*. See *Valesius*'s Note upon *Socrates*.

Sect. 4. *Sometimes called* Theophori *&* Christophori.

Another Name which frequently occurs in the Writings of the Ancients, is that of Θεοφόροι; which signifies *Temples of God*, and is as old as *Ignatius*, who usually

[*i*] Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. p. 294. Strom. 2. p. 383. Strom. 6. p. 665. Strom. 7. p. 748. [*k*] Athan. ap. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 4. c. 23. [*l*] Socrat. ibid.

gave

gave himſelf this Title; as appears, both from the Inſcriptions of his Epiſtles, each of which begins, Ἰγνάτιος ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος; as alſo from the ancient Acts of his Martyrdom, where [m] the Reaſon of the Name is explained in his Dialogue with *Trajan*; who hearing him ſtile himſelf *Theophorus*, asked what that Name meant? To which *Ignatius* replied, That it meant one that carried Chriſt in his Heart. Doſt thou then, ſaid *Trajan*, carry him that was crucify'd in thy Heart? *Ignatius* anſwered, Yes: For it is written, *I will dwell in them, and walk in them.* *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius* indeed gives another Reaſon, why *Ignatius* was called *Theophorus*; becauſe he was the Child whom our Saviour took, and ſet in the midſt of his Diſciples, laying his Hands upon him; and therefore the Apoſtles would never preſume to Ordain him again by Impoſition of Hands after Chriſt. But as Biſhop *Pearſon* [n] and others have obſerved, this was a meer Invention of the modern *Greeks*, from whom *Anaſtaſius* took it without farther Enquiry. Much more ridiculous and abſurd, is the Reaſon which is aſſigned by *Vincentius* [o] *Bellovacenſis* and ſome others; That *Ignatius* was ſo called, becauſe the Name of Jeſus Chriſt was found written in Golden Letters in his Heart. Both theſe Fancies are ſufficiently refelled by the Genuine Acts of his Martyrdom; which give a more Rational Account of the Name, and ſuch as plainly intimates that it was no peculiar Title of *Ignatius*, but common to him with all other Chriſtians: As indeed Biſhop *Pearſon* does abundantly prove from ſeveral Paſſages of *Clemens Alexandri-*

[m] Acta Ignat. ap. Grabe Spicil. T. 2. p. 10.
[n] Pearſon Vind. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 12. p. 397. Cave's *Life of* Ignatius. Grabe Spicil. T. 2. p. 2. [o] Vincent. Specul. Lib. 10. c. 7.

nus, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Palladius*, *Eulogius*, *Theodoret*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Photius*, *Maximus*, and others. Particularly *Clemens* [*p*] aſſigns the ſame Reaſon of the Name, as *Ignatius* does; That the Chriſtian is therefore called Θεοφορῶν and Θεοφορέμενον, becauſe, as the Apoſtle ſays, he is *the Temple of God*. We ſometimes alſo meet with the Name *Chriſtophori* in the ſame Senſe; as in the Epiſtle of *Phileas*, Biſhop of *Thmuis*, recorded by *Euſebius*; where ſpeaking of the Martyrs of his own time, he gives them the Title of χειστόφοροι μάρτυρες, [*q*] becauſe they were Temples of Chriſt, and acted by his Holy Spirit.

Sect. 5. *And ſometimes, but very rarely,* Chriſti.

St. *Ambroſe*, in one place, gives them the Name of *Chriſti*, in a qualify'd Senſe; alluding to the Signification of the Word *Chriſtus* in Scripture; where it ſometimes ſignifies any one that is anointed with Oyl, or receives any Commiſſion from God by a Spiritual Unction. In which Senſe, every Chriſtian is the Lord's Anointed. And therefore he ſays, it is no Injury [*r*] for the Servant to bear the Character of his Lord, nor for the Soldier to be called by the Name of his General; foraſmuch as God himſelf hath ſaid, *Touch not mine anointed*, or my *Chriſts*; *Chriſtos meos*, as now the Vulgar Tranſlation reads it, (*Pſal.* 105. 15.) And St. *Jerom* alſo, who in his Notes upon the Place [*s*] obſerves, That all Men

[*p*] Clem. Strom. Lib. 7. p. 748. [*q*] Euſeb. Lib. 8. c. 10. [*r*] Ambroſ. de Obit. Valentin. T. 3. p. 12. Nec injuriam putes, Characteri Domini inſcribuntur & Servuli, & nomine Imperatoris ſignantur Milites. Denique & ipſe Dominus dixit, Nolite tangere Chriſtos meos. [*s*] Hieron. Com. in Pſal. 104. Ecce ante Legem Patriarchæ non uncti Regali unguento, Chriſti dicuntur. Chriſti autem ſunt, qui Spiritu Sancto unguntur.

are called *Chriſts*, who are anointed with the Holy Ghoſt; as the Ancient Patriarchs before the Law, who had no other Unction. Yet we do not find that the Chriſtians generally took this Name upon them, but rather reſerved it to their Lord, as his peculiar Name and Title.

Sect. 6. *Chriſtians great Enemies to all Party-Names, and Human Appellations.*

Yet it is very obſervable, That in all the Names they choſe, there was ſtill ſome peculiar Relation to Chriſt and God, from whom they would be named, and not from any Mortal Man, how great or eminent ſoever. Party-Names, and Human Appellations, they ever profeſſed to abhor. We take not our Denomination from Men, ſays *Chryſoſtom*; [*t*] We have no Leaders, as the Followers of *Marcion*, or *Manichæus*, or *Arius*. No, ſays *Epiphanius*, [*u*] The Church was never called ſo much as by the Name of any Apoſtle: We never heard of *Petrians*, or *Paulians*, or *Bartholomæans*, or *Thaddæans*; but only of Chriſtians, from Chriſt. I honour *Peter*, ſays another Father [*w*], but I am not called a *Petrian*; I honour *Paul*, but I am not called a *Paulian*: I cannot bear to be named from any Man, who am the Creature of God. They obſerve, that this was only the Property of Sects and Hereſies, to take Party-Names, and denominate themſelves from their Leaders. The great and venerable Name of Chriſtians was neglected by them, whilſt they prophanely divided themſelves into Human Appellations; as *Gregory Nyſſen* [*x*] and *Nazianzen* complain. Thus *Ba-*

[*t*] Chryſoſt. Hom. 33. in Act. [*u*] Epiphan. Hær. 42. Marcionit. Item Hær. 10. [*w*] Greg. Naz. Orat. 31. p. 506. *See alſo* Athan. Orat. 2. contra Arian. Greg. Nyſſ. de Perfect. Chriſt. T. 3. p. 276. [*x*] Nyſſ. contra Apollin. T. 3. p. 261. Naz. Orat. ad Epiſcop.

ſil obſerves [*y*] how the *Marcionites* and *Valentinians* rejected the Name of *Chriſtians*, to be called after the Names of *Marcion* and *Valentinus*, their Leaders. *Optatus* [*z*] and St. *Auſtin* [*a*] bring the ſame Charge againſt the *Donatiſts*. *Optatus* ſays, it was the uſual Queſtion of *Donatus* to all Foreigners; *Quid apud vos agitur de Parte mea?* How go the Affairs of my Party among you? And the Biſhops who were his Followers, were uſed to ſubſcribe themſelves, *Ex Parte Donati*. *Epiphanius* obſerves the ſame of the *Audians*, [*b*] *Colluthians*, and *Arians*: And he tells us more particularly of *Meletius* and his Followers, [*c*] That having formed a Schiſm, they left the old Name of the Catholick Church, and ſtiled themſelves by a diſtinguiſhing Character, *The Church of the Martyrs*; with an invidious Deſign, to caſt a Reproach upon all others that were not of their Party. In like manner, as the *Arians* ſtiled themſelves *Lucianiſts* [*d*] and *Conlucianiſts*, pretending to follow the Doctrine of *Lucian* the Martyr.

But the Church of Chriſt ſtill kept to the Name of *Chriſtian*. This was the Name they gloried in as moſt expreſſive of their Unity and Relation to Chriſt. *Euſebius* [*e*] records a memorable Story out of the Epiſtle of the Churches of *Lyons* and *Vienna*, in *France*; concerning one *Sanctus* a Deacon of the Church of *Vienna*, who ſuffer'd in the Perſecution under *Antonine*; That being put to the Rack, and examined by the Magiſtrates concerning his Name, his Country, his City, his Quality, whether

[*y*] Baſil. Com. in Pſal. 48. p. 245. [*z*] Optat. Lib. 3. p. 66. [*a*] Aug. Ep. 68. ad Januar. [*b*] Epiph. Hær. 70, Audianor. Id. Hær. 69. Arian. [*c*] Epiph. Hær. 68. Meletian. [*d*] Theodor. Hiſt. Eccl. Lib. 1. c. 5. Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. [*e*] Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 1.

he

he were bond or free; his Anſwer to all their Queſtion was, *I am a Chriſtian*: This, he ſaid, was to him both Name and City, and Kindred and every thing. Nor could the Heathen with all their Skill extort any other Anſwer from him. St. *Chryſoſtom* [*f*] gives the like Account of the Behaviour of *Lucian* the Martyr before his Perſecutors; and there are ſome other Inſtances of the ſame Nature, by which we may judge how great a Veneration they had for the Name Chriſtian.

Sect. 7. *Of the Name Catholick, and its Antiquity.*

The Importunity of Hereticks made them add another Name to this, *viz.* that of Catholick; which was as it were their Sirname, or Characteriſtick, to diſtinguiſh them from all Sects, who though they had Party-Names, yet ſometimes ſheltered themſelves under the common Name of Chriſtians. This we learn from *Pacian*'s Epiſtle [*g*] to *Sempronian* the *Novatian* Heretick, who demanding of him the Reaſon why Chriſtians called themſelves Catholicks; He anſwers, that it was to diſcern them from Hereticks, who went by the Name of Chriſtians. *Chriſtian* is my Name, ſays he, and *Catholick* my Sirname: The one is my Title, the other my Character or Mark of Diſtinction. Hereticks commonly confined Religion, either to a particular Region, or ſome ſelect Party of Men, and therefore had no Pretence to ſtile themſelves Catholicks: But the Church of Chriſt had a juſt Title to this Name, being called Catholick (as *Optatus* [*h*] obſerves) be-

[*f*] Chryſoſt. Homil. 46. in Lucian. T. 1. p. 602.

[*g*] Pacian. Ep. 1. ad Sempronian. Chriſtianus mihi nomen eſt, Catholicus Cognomen. Illud me nuncupat, Iſtud oſtendit.

[*h*] Optat. Lib. 2. p. 46. Cum inde dicta ſit Catholica, quod ſit Rationalis & ubique diffuſa.

cauſe

cauſe it was univerſally diffuſed over all the World. And in this Senſe the Name is as ancient almoſt as the Church it ſelf. For we meet with it in the Paſſion of *Polycarp* [*i*] in *Euſebius*, in *Clemens* [*k*] *Alexandrinus*, and *Ignatius* [*l*]. And ſo great a Regard had they for this Name, that they would own none to be Chriſtians, who did not profeſs themſelves to be of the Catholick Church. As we may ſee in the [*m*] Acts of *Pionius* the Martyr, who being asked by *Polemo* the Judge, Of what Church he was? Anſwered, I am of the Catholick Church: For Chriſt has no other.

Sect. 8. *In what Senſe the Name*, Eccleſiaſticks, *given to all Chriſtians.*

I muſt here obſerve farther, that the Name of *Eccleſiaſticks* was ſometimes attributed to all Chriſtians in general. For though this was a peculiar Name of the Clergy, as contradiſtinct from the Laity in the Chriſtian Church; yet when Chriſtians in general are ſpoken of, in Oppoſition to *Jews*, Infidels and Hereticks, then they have all the Name of *Eccleſiaſticks*, or Men of the Church; as being neither of the *Jewiſh* Synagogues, nor of the Heathen Temples, nor Heretical Conventicles, but Members of the Church of Chriſt. In this Senſe ἀνδρὲς ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ is often uſed by [*n*] *Euſebius* and *Cyril* [*o*] of *Jeruſalem*. And *Valeſius* [*p*] obſerves the ſame in *Origen*, *Epiphanius*, St. *Jerome* and others.

Sect. 9. *The Chriſtian Religion*

Sometimes alſo we find the Word Δόγμα put abſolutely to ſig-

[*i*] Euſeb. lib. 4. c. 15. [*k*] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 7. [*l*] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. [*m*] Act. Pionii ap. Baron. an 254. n 9. Cujus, inquit Polemo, es Eccleſiæ? Reſpondit Pionius, Catholicæ: Nulla enim eſt alia apud Chriſtum. [*n*] Euſeb. Lib. 4. c. 7. Lib. 5. cap. 27.
[*o*] Cyril. Catech. 15. n. 4. [*p*] Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. Lib. 2. cap. 25.

nify

nify the Chriſtian Religion; as *Chryſoſtom* [q] and *Theodoret* [r] ſay, St. *Paul* himſelf uſes the Word in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, 2. 15. And *Eſtius* [s] aſſures us it was the common Interpretation of all Ancient Expoſitors, both *Greek* and *Latin*, upon that Place. And hence it was that Chriſtians were called ſometimes οἱ τῆς Δόγματος, Men of the Faith, meaning the Faith of Chriſt. As in the Reſcript of *Aurelian* the Emperor againſt *Paulus Samoſatenſis*, recorded by [t] *Euſebius*, the Biſhops of *Italy* and *Rome* are ſtiled, Ἐπίσκοποι τῆς Δόγματος, Biſhops of the Faith, that is, the Chriſtian Faith.

gion called Δόγμα, *and Chriſtians* οἱ τῆς Δόγματος.

Sect 10. *Chriſtians called* Jews *by the Heathen.*

The Heathens alſo were uſed to confound the Names of *Jews* and *Chriſtians* together: Whence in Heathen Authors the Name of *Jews* by miſtake is often given to the Chriſtians. Thus *Dio* in the Life of *Domitian* [u] ſpeaking of *Acilius Glabrio*, a Man of Conſular Dignity, ſays he was accuſed of Atheiſm, and put to Death for turning to the *Jews* Religion: Which, as *Baronius* [w] and others obſerve, muſt mean the Chriſtian Religion, for which he was a Martyr. So when *Suetonius* [x] ſays, that *Claudius* expelled the *Jews* from *Rome*, becauſe they grew tumultuous by the Inſtigations of *Chreſtus*; 'tis generally concluded by Learned [y] Men, that under the Name of *Jews*

[q] Chryſ. Hom. 5. in Epheſ. [r] Theod. Com. in Epheſ. 2 15. [s] Eſt. Com. in Eph. 2. 14.

[t] Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 30. [u] Dio in Domit.

[w] Baron. an. 94. n. 1. [x] Sueton. Claud. c. 26. Judæos Impulſore Chreſto aſſidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.

[y] Hotting. Hiſt. Eccl. T. 1. p. 37. Baſnag. Exerc. in Baron. p. 139. Selden, de Synedr. Lib. 1. c. 8, *who cites* Lipſius, Petavius, *and many others.*

he

he alſo comprehends the *Chriſtians*. In like manner when *Spartian* [z] ſays of *Caracalla*'s Playfellow, that he was of the *Jewiſh* Religion, he doubtleſs means the *Chriſtian*: Foraſmuch as *Tertullian* [a] tells us that *Caracalla* himſelf was nurſed by a Chriſtian.

Sect. 11. *Chriſt by the Heathens commonly called* Chreſtus, *and Chriſtians*, Chreſtians.

The Heathens committed another miſtake in the Pronunciation of our Saviour's Name, whom they generally called *Chreſtus* inſtead of *Chriſtus*; and his Followers *Chreſtians* for *Chriſtians*: Which is taken notice of by *Juſtin Martyr* [b], *Tertullian* [c], *Lactantius* [d], and ſome others: who correct their Miſtake, though they have no great Quarrel with them upon this Account; for both Names are of good Signification. *Chriſtus* is the ſame with the *Hebrew* Meſſias, and ſignifies a Perſon anointed to be a Prieſt or King; and *Chreſtus* being the ſame with the *Greek* Χρηστὸς, implies Sweetneſs and Goodneſs. Whence *Tertullian* [e] tells them, that they were unpardonable for proſecuting Chriſtians merely for their Name, becauſe both Names were Innocent, and of excellent Signification.

The Chriſtians therefore did not wholly reject this Name, though it was none of their own Impoſing. As neither did they refuſe to be called *Jews*, in that Senſe as the Scripture uſes the Word, to diſtinguiſh the People of God from *the Synagogue of Satan*, Rev.

[z] Spartian. in Caracal. c. 1. [a] Tertul. ad Scapul. c. 4. Lacte Chriſtiano educatus. [b] Juſt. M. Apol. 2. [c] Tertul. Apol. c. 3. [d] Lact. Lib. 4. c. 7. [e] Tertul. ibid. Chriſtianus quantum interpretatio eſt, de Unctione deducitur. Sed & cum perperam Chreſtianus pronunciatur à vobis (nam nec Nominis certa eſt notitia penes vos) de ſuavitate vel benignitate compoſitum eſt. Oditur ergo in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum.

2. 9. Though to avoid the Subtilties of the *Ebionites* and *Nazarens*, who were for blending the Ceremonies of the Law with the Faith of the Goſpel, they rather choſe to avoid that Name, and ſtuck to the Name of Chriſtians.

CHAP. II.

Of the Names of Reproach which the Jews, *Infidels and Hereticks caſt upon the Chriſtians.*

Sect. 1. *Chriſtians called* Nazarens *by the* Jews *and* Heathens.

BEſides the Names already ſpoken of, there were ſome other reproachful Names caſt upon them by their Adverſaries, which it will not be improper here to mention. The firſt of theſe was *Nazarens*, a Name of Reproach given them firſt by the *Jews*, by whom they are ſtiled the Sect of the *Nazarens*, Act. 24. 5. There was indeed a particular Hereſy, who call'd themſelves Ναζωραῖοι: And *Epiphanius* [*f*] thinks the *Jews* had a more eſpecial Spite at them, becauſe they were a ſort of *Jewiſh* Apoſtates, who kept Circumciſion and the *Moſaical* Rites together with the Chriſtian Religion: And therefore, he ſays, they were uſed to Curſe and Anathematize them Three times a Day, Morning, Noon and Evening, when they met in their Synagogues to pray, in this direful Form of Execration, ὁπικαταράσαι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺ ναζωραίους, *Send thy Curſe, O God, upon the* Nazarens. But St. *Jerom* [*g*] ſays this was levelled at Chriſtians in

[*f*] Epiphan. Hær. 29. n. 9. [*g*] Hieron. Com. in Eſa. 49. T. 5. p. 178. Ter per ſingulos dies ſub nomine Nazarenorum maledicunt in Synagogis ſuis.

gene-

general, whom they thus anathematized under the Name of *Nazarens*. And this ſeems moſt probable, becauſe as both St. *Jerom* [*h*] and *Epiphanius* himſelf [*i*] obſerves, the *Jews* termed all Chriſtians by way of Reproach, *Nazarens*. And the *Gentiles* took it from the *Jews*, as appears from that of *Datianus* the Prætor in *Prudentius*, [*k*] where ſpeaking to the Chriſtians, he gives them the Name of *Nazarens*. Some [*l*] think the Chriſtians at firſt were very free to own this Name, and eſteemed it no Reproach, till ſuch time as the Hereſy of the *Nazarens* broke out, and then in Deteſtation of that Hereſy they forſook that Name, and called themſelves *Chriſtians*, *Acts* 11. 26. But whether this be ſaid according to the exact Rules of Chronology, I leave thoſe that are better skilled to determine.

Sect. 2. *And* Galilæans.

Another Name of Reproach was that of *Galilæans*, which was *Julian*'s ordinary Stile, whenever he ſpake of *Chriſt* or Chriſtians. Thus in his Dialogue with old *Maris* a blind Chriſtian Biſhop, mentioned by *Sozomen*, [*m*] he told him by way of Scoff, *Thy* Galilæan *God will not cure thee*. And again, in his Epiſtle [*n*] to *Arſacius* High-Prieſt of *Galatia*, The *Galilæans* maintain their own Poor and ours alſo. The like may be obſerved in *Socrates* [*o*], *Theodoret* [*p*], *Chryſoſtom* [*q*], and *Gregory Nazianzen* [*r*], who adds, That he not only called

[*h*] Id. de Loc. Hebr. T. 3. p. 289. Nos apud veteres, quaſi opprobrio Nazaræi dicebamur, quos nunc Chriſtianos vocant.

[*i*] Epiphan. ibid. [*k*] Prudent. περὶ στεφανῶν. Carm. 5. de S. Vincent.

Vos Nazareni aſſiſtite,
Rudemq; ritum ſpernite. Id. Hymno 9. de Rom. Mart.

[*l*] Junius Parallel. Lib. 1. c. 8. Godwyn *Jew. Rites*. Lib. 1. c. 8.

[*m*] Sozom. Lib. 5. c. 4. [*n*] Ap. Sozom. Lib 5. c. 16.

[*o*] Socrat. Lib. 3. c. 12. [*p*] Theodor. Lib. 3. c. 7. & 21. [*q*] Chryſ. Hom. 63. Tom. 5. [*r*] Naz. 1. Invectiv.

them

them *Galilæans* himself, but made a Law that no one should call them by any other Name; thinking thereby to abolish the Name of Christians.

Sect. 3. *Also Atheists.*

They also called them Atheists, and their Religion the Atheism or Impiety, because they derided the Worship of the Heathen Gods. *Dio* [s] says, *Acilius Glabrio* was put to Death for Atheism, meaning the Christian Religion. And the Christian Apologists, *Athenagoras* [t], *Justin Martyr* [u], *Arnobius* [w], and others, reckon this among the Crimes which the Heathens usually lay to their Charge. *Eusebius* says [x] the Name was become so common, that when the Persecuting Magistrates would oblige a Christian to renounce his Religion, they bad him abjure it in this Form, by saying among other things, αἶρε τοὺς Ἀθέους, *Confusion to the Atheists, Away with the Impious*, meaning the Christians.

Sect. 4. *And* Greeks *and Impostors.*

To this they added the Name of *Grecks* and Impostors. Which is noted by St. *Jerom* [y] who says, Whereſoever they saw a Christian, they would presently cry out, ὁ γραικὸς ὑπο-βάτης, Behold a *Grecian* Impostor! This was the Character which the *Jews* gave our Saviour, ὁ πλάνος, That Deceiver. *Mat.* 27. 63. And *Justin* [z] *Martyr* says, they endeavoured to propagate it to Posterity, sending their Apostles or Emissaries from *Jerusalem* to all the Synagogues in the World, to bid them beware of a certain Impious, Lawless Sect,

[s] Dio in Domitian. [t] Athen. Legat. pro Christ.
[u] Just. Apol. 1. p. 47. [w] Arnob. Lib. 1.
[x] Euseb. Lib. 4. c. 15. [y] Hieron. Ep. 10. ad Furiam. Ubicunque viderint Christianum, statim illud de Trivio, γραικὸς ὑποβάτης, vocant Impostorem. [z] Justin. Dial. c. Tryph. p. 335.

late-

lately risen up under one *Jesus* a *Galilæan* Impostor. Hence *Lucian* [*a*] took occasion in his Blasphemous Raillery to style him the Crucifyed Sophister. And *Celsus* [*b*] commonly gives him and his Followers the Name of γοητὰι, Deceivers. So *Asclepiades* the Judge in *Prudentius*, [*c*] complements them with the Appellation of Sophisters; And *Ulpian* [*d*] proscribes them in a Law by the Name of Impostors.

The Reason why they added the Name of *Greeks* to that of Impostors, was (as Learned Men [*e*] conjecture) because many of the Christian Philosophers took upon them the *Grecian* or Philosophick Habit, which was the περιβόλαιον or *Pallium*: Whence the *Greeks* were called *Palliati*, as the *Romans* were called *Togati*, or *Gens Togata*, from their proper Habit, which was the *Toga*. Now it being some Offence to the *Romans* to see the Christians quit the *Roman* Gown, to wear the *Grecian* Cloak; they thence took occasion to mock and deride them with the scurrilous Names of *Greeks*, and *Grecian* Impostors. *Tertullian*'s Book *de Pallio* was written to shew the spiteful Malice of this foolish Objection.

Sect. 5. *Magicians.*

But the Heathens went one step farther in their Malice: and because our Saviour and his Followers did many Miracles, which they imputed to Evil Arts and the Power of Magick; they therefore generally declaimed against them as Magicians, and

[*a*] Lucian. Peregrin. [*b*] Cels. ap. Orig. Lib. 1. p. 6.

[*c*] Prudent. περὶ στεφ. Carm 9. de Romano Mart. Quis hos Sophistas error invexit novus? &c.

[*d*] Digest. Lib. 50. Tit. 13. c. 1. Si incantavit, si inprecatus est, si (ut vulgari verbo Impostorum utar) si exorcisavit.

[*e*] Kortholt. de Morib. Christian. c. 3. p. 23. Baron. an. 56. n. 11.

un-

under that Character expoſed them to the Fury of the Vulgar. *Celſus* [*f*] and others pretended that our Saviour ſtudied Magick in *Egypt*: And St. *Auſtin* [*g*] ſays, it was generally believed among the Heathen, that he wrote ſome Books about Magick too, which he delivered to *Peter* and *Paul* for the uſe of his Diſciples. Hence it was that *Suetonius* [*h*] ſpeaking in the Language of his Party, calls the Chriſtians, *Genus hominum Superſtitionis Maleficæ*, The Men of the Magical Superſtition. As *Aſclepiades* the Judge in *Prudentius* [*i*] ſtiles St. *Romanus* the Martyr, Arch-Magician. And St. *Ambroſe* obſerves in the Paſſion of St. *Agnes* [*k*] how the People cryed out againſt her, Away with the Sorcereſs! Away with the Enchanter! Nothing being more common, than to term all Chriſtians, eſpecially ſuch as wrought Miracles, [*l*] by the odious Name of Sorcerers and Magicians.

Sect. 6. *The New Superſtition.*

The New Superſtition was another Name of Reproach for the Chriſtian Religion. *Suetonius* gives it that Title, [*m*], and *Pliny* and *Tacitus* add to it [*n*] the Opprobrious Terms of wicked and unreaſonable Superſtition. By which Name alſo *Nero* triumphed over it, in his Trophies which he ſet up at *Rome*, when he had haraſſed the Chriſtians with a moſt ſevere Perſecution. He gloried that he had purged the Country of Robbers,

[*f*] Origen. cont. Celſ. Lib. 2. Arnobius lib. 1. p. 36. [*g*] Aug. de Conſenſu Evang. Lib. 1. c. 9. [*h*] Sueton. Neron. c. 16. [*i*] Prudent. περὶ στεφ. Hymn. 9. de S. Romano. Quouſque tandem ſummus hic nobis Magus illudit? [*k*] Ambr. Serm. 90. in S. Agnen. Tolle Magam! Tolle Maleficam! [*l*] *See* Kortholt de Morib. Chriſt. c. 4. [*m*] Sueton. Nero. c. 16. [*n*] Plin. Lib. 10. Ep. 97. Nihil aliud inveni, quam Superſtitionem Pravam & Immodicam. Tacit. Annal. 15 c 44. Exitiabilis ſuperſtitio.

and thoſe that obtruded and inculcated the new Superſtition [o] upon Mankind. By this, there can be no doubt he meant the Chriſtians, whoſe Religion is called the Superſtition in other Inſcriptions of the like Nature. See that of *Diocletian* cited in *Baronius*, *An.* 304. from *Occo*. *Superſtitione Chriſtianorum ubiq; deleta, &c.*

Not much unlike this was that other Name which *Porphyry* [p] and ſome others give it, when they call it the Barbarous, New, and Strange Religion. In the Acts of the Famous Martyrs of *Lyons*, who ſuffered under *Antoninus Pius*, the Heathens ſcornfully inſult it with this Character. For having burnt the Martyrs to Aſhes, and ſcattered their Remains into the River *Rhone*, they ſaid, they did it to cut off their Hopes of a Reſurrection, upon the ſtrength of which they ſought to obtrude [q] the New and Strange Religion upon Mankind. But now let us ſee whether they will riſe again, and whether their God can help and deliver them out of our Hands.

Sect. 7. *Chriſtians, why called* Sibylliſts.

Celſus gives them the Name of *Sibylliſts* [r], becauſe the Chriſtians in their Diſputes with the Heathens, ſometimes made uſe of the Authority of *Sibylla* their own Propheteſs againſt them; whoſe Writings they urged with ſo much Advantage to the Chriſtian Cauſe, and Prejudice to the Heathen, that *Juſtin Martyr* [s] ſays, the *Roman* Governors made it Death for any one to read them, or *Hyſtaſpes*, or the Writings of the Prophets.

[o] Inſcript. Antiq. ad Calcem Sueton. Oxon. NERONI. CLAUD. CAIS. AUG. PONT. MAX. OB. PROVINC. LATRONIB. ET. HIS. QUI. NOVAM. GENERI. HUM. SUPERSTITION. INCULCAB. PURGAT. [p] Ap. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. Lib. 6. c. 19. Βάρβαρον πόλιτευμα. [q] Act. Mart. Lugd. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 1. Θρησκείαν ξένην καὶ καινήν. [r] Origen. c. Celſ. Lib. 5. p. 272. [s] Juſt. Apol. 2. p. 82.

They

Sect. 8. Biathanati.

They alſo reproached them with the Appellation of Βιαθάνατοι, *Self-Murderers*, becauſe they readily offered themſelves up to Martyrdom, and chearfully underwent any violent Death, which the Heathens could inflict upon them. With what eagerneſs they courted Death, we learn not only from the Chriſtian [t] Writers themſelves, but from the Teſtimonies of the Heathens [u] concerning them. *Lucian* [w] ſays they not only deſpiſed Death, but many of them voluntarily offered themſelves to it, out of a Perſuaſion that they ſhould be made Immortal, and live for ever. This he reckons Folly, and therefore gives them the Name of Κακοδαίμονες, the Miſerable Wretches that threw away their Lives. In which Senſe *Porphyry* [x] alſo ſtiles the Chriſtian Religion, Βάρβαρον τόλμημα, *The Barbarous Boldneſs*. As *Arrius Antoninus* [y] terms the Profeſſors of it, ὦ δειλοὶ, *The Stupid Wretches*, that had ſuch a mind to die; And the Heathen in *Minucius* [z], *Homines deploratæ ac deſperatæ Factionis*, The Men of the Forlorn and Deſperate Faction. All which agrees with the Name *Biathanati*, or *Biæothanati*, as *Baronius* [a] underſtands it. Though it may ſignify not only Self-Murderers, but (as a Learned Critick [b] notes) Men that expect to live after Death. In which Senſe the Heathens probably might uſe it likewiſe, to ridicule the Chriſtian Doctrine of the Reſurrection; on which, they knew, all their fearleſs and undaunted Courage was founded. For ſo the ſame Heathen in *Minucius* endeavours to expoſe at once both their Reſolution and

[t] *See theſe Collected in* Pearſon Vind. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 9. p. 384. [u] Arrius Antonin. ap. Tertul. ad Scap. c. 4. Tiberian. in Joh. Malela Chronic. [w] Lucian. de Mort. Peregrin. [x] Porphyr. ap. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 19. [y] Tertul. ibid. [z] Minuc. Octav. p. 25. [a] Baron. an. 138. n. 5. [b] Suicer. Theſaur. Eccleſiaſt. T. 1. p. 690.

their Belief: O Strange Folly, and incredible Madneſs! ſays he; they deſpiſe all preſent Torments, and yet fear thoſe that are Future and Uncertain: They are afraid of dying after Death, but in the mean time do not fear to die. So vainly do they flatter themſelves, and allay their Fears, with the hopes of ſome reviving Comforts after Death. For one of theſe Reaſons then they gave them the Name of *Biothanati*, which Word expreſly occurs in ſome of the Acts of the ancient Martyrs. *Baronius* obſerves [c] out of *Bede*'s Martyrology, that when the Seven Sons of *Symphoroſa* were Martyred under *Hadrian*, their Bodies were all caſt into one Pit together, which the Temple-Prieſts named from them, *Ad ſeptem Biothanatos*, The Grave of the Seven *Biothanati*.

Sect. 9. Parabolarii, *and* Deſperati.

For the ſame Reaſon they gave them the Names of *Parabolarii* and *Deſperati*, The Bold and Deſperate Men. The *Parabolarii* or *Parabolani* among the *Romans*, were thoſe bold adventurous Men, who hired out themſelves to fight with wild Beaſts upon the Stage or Amphitheatre, whence they had alſo the Name of *Beſtiarii*, and *Confectores*. Now becauſe the Chriſtians were put to fight for their Lives in the ſame manner, and they rather choſe to do it than deny their Religion, they therefore got the Name of *Paraboli*, and *Parabolani*: Which though it was intended as a Name of Reproach and Mockery, yet the Chriſtians were not unwilling to take it to themſelves, being one of the trueſt Characters that the Heathens ever gave them. And therefore they ſometimes gave themſelves this Name by way of Alluſion to the *Roman Paraboli*. As in the Paſſion * of *Abdo* and *Senne* in the time of *Valerian*, the Martyrs who were expoſed to be devoured by Wild

[c] Baron. an. 138. n. 5. * Acta Abdon. & Sennes ap. Suicer. Beaſts

Beaſts in the Amphitheatre, are ſaid to enter, *Ut audaciſſimi Parabolani*, as moſt reſolute Champions, that deſpiſed their own Lives for their Religion's ſake. But the other Name of *Deſperati* they rejected as a Calumny, retorting it back upon their Adverſaries, who more juſtly deſerved it. Thoſe, ſays *Lactantius* [*d*], who ſet a Value upon their Faith, and will not deny their God, they firſt torment and butcher them with all their might, and then call them *Deſperado's*, becauſe they will not ſpare their own Bodies: As if any thing could be more Deſperate, than to torture and tear in pieces thoſe whom you cannot but know to be Innocent.

Sect. 10. Sarmentitii, *and* Semaxii.

Tertullian mentions another Name, which was likewiſe occaſion'd by their Sufferings. The Martyrs which were burnt alive, were uſually tied to a Board or Stake of about Six Foot long, which the *Romans* called *Semaxis*; and then they were ſurrounded or covered with Faggots of ſmall Wood, which they called *Sarmenta*. From this their Puniſhment, the Heathen who turned every thing into Mockery, gave all Chriſtians the deſpiteful Name of *Sarmentitii* and *Semaxii* [*e*].

Sect. 11. Lucifugax Natio.

The Heathen in *Minucius* [*f*] takes occaſion alſo to reproach them under the Name of the Skulking Generation, or the Men that loved to prate in Corners and the Dark. The ground of which Scurrilous Reflection was only this, That they were forced to hold their Religious Aſſemblies in the

[*d*.] Lact. Inſtit. Lib. 5. c. 9. Deſperatos vocant, quia corpori suo minime parcunt, &c. [*e*] Tertul. Apol. c. 50. Licet nunc Sarmentitios & Semaxios appelletis, quia ad Stipitem dimidii Axis revincti, Sarmentorum ambitu exurimur. [*f*] Minuc. Octav. p. 25. Latebroſa & Lucifugax Natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula.

Night to avoid the Fury of the Perſecutions. Which *Celſus* [*g*] himſelf owns, though otherwiſe prone enough to load them with hard Names and odious Reflections.

Sect. 12. Plautina Proſapia, *and* Piſtores.

The ſame Heathen in *Minucius* gives them one ſcurrilous Name more, which it is not very eaſy to gueſs the meaning of. He calls them *Plautinians* [*h*], *Homines Plautinæ Proſapiæ*. *Rigaltius* [*i*] takes it for a Ridicule upon the Poverty and Simplicity of the Chriſtians, whom the Heathens commonly repreſented as a Company of poor ignorant Mechanicks, Bakers, Taylors, and the like; Men of the ſame Quality with *Plautus*, who as St. *Jerom* [*k*] obſerves, was ſo Poor, that in a time of Famine he was forced to hire out himſelf to a Baker to grind at his Mill, during which time he wrote Three of his Plays in the Intervals of his Labour. Such ſort of Men *Cæcilius* ſays the Chriſtians were; and therefore he ſtiles *Octavius* in the Dialogue, *Homo Plautinæ Proſapiæ, & Piſtorum præcipuus*, A *Plautinian*, a chief Man among the Illiterate Bakers, but no Philoſopher. The ſame Reflection is often made by *Celſus*. You ſhall ſee, ſays he [*l*], Weavers, Taylors, Fullers, and the moſt Illiterate and Ruſtick Fellows, who dare not ſpeak a Word before Wiſe Men, when they can get a Company of Children and ſilly Women together, ſet up to teach ſtrange Paradoxes amongſt them. This is one of their Rules, ſays he again [*m*], Let no Man that is Learned, Wiſe, or Prudent, come among us; but if any be Unlearned, or a Child, or an Idiot, let him freely come;

[*g*] Origen. c. Celſ. Lib. 1. p. 5. [*h*] Minuc. p. 37. Quid ad hæc audet Octavius homo Plautinæ Proſapiæ, ut Piſtorum præcipuus ita poſtremus Philoſophorum? [*i*] Rigalt. in Loc. [*k*] Hieron. Chronic. an. 1. Olymp. 145. [*l*] Origen. c. Celſ. Lib. 3. p. 144. [*m*] Ibid. p. 137.

So

So they openly declare, that none but Fools and Sots, and such as want Sense, Slaves, Women and Children, are fit Disciples for the God they worship.

Sect. 13. *With what Names the Hereticks reproached the Orthodox Christians.*

Nor was it only the Heathens that thus reviled them, but commonly every perverse Sect among the Christians, had some reproachful Name to cast upon them. The *Novatian* Party called them *Cornelians* [o], because they communicated with *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, rather than with *Novatianus* his Antagonist. They also termed them *Apostaticks*, *Capitolins*, *Synedrians*, because [p] they charitably decreed in their Synods to receive Apostates, and such as went to the *Capitol* to Sacrifice, into their Communion again upon their sincere Repentance. The *Nestorians* [q] termed the Orthodox *Cyrillians*; and the *Arians* [r] called them *Eustathians* and *Paulinians*, from *Eustathius* and *Paulinus* Bishops of *Antioch*. As also *Homoousians*, because they kept to the Doctrine of the ὁμοούσιον, which declared the Son of God to be of the same Substance with the Father. The Author of the *Opus Imperfectum* on St. *Matthew*, under the Name of *Chrysostom* [s] stiles them expressly, *Hæresis Homoousianorum*, The Heresy of the *Homoousians*. And so *Serapion* in his Conflict wth *Arnobius* [t] calls them *Homoousianates*, which the Printed Copy reads corruptly *Homuncionates*, which was a Name for the *Nestorians*.

[o] Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280. [p] Pacian. Ep. 2. ad Sempronian. [q] Ep. Legat. Schismat. ad suos in Epheso in Act. Con. Ephes. Con. T. 3. p. 746. [r] Sozom. Lib. 6. c. 21. [s] Opus Imperf. Hom. 48. [t] Conflict. Arnob. & Serap. ad calcem Irenæi. p. 519.

Sect. 14. *Chriſtians called* Pſychici *by the* Montaniſts.

The *Cataphrygians* or *Montaniſts*, commonly called the Orthodox Ψυχικὸς, Carnal; becauſe they rejected the Prophecies and pretended Inſpirations of *Montanus*, and would not receive his Rigid Laws about Faſting, nor abſtain from Second Marriages, and obſerve Four *Lents* in a Year, *&c.* This was *Tertullian's* ordinary Compliment to the Chriſtians in all his Books [*u*] written after he was fallen into the Errors of *Montanus*. He calls his own Party *The Spiritual*; and the Orthodox the *Carnal*: And ſome of his Books [*w*] are expreſly entituled, *Adverſus Pſychicos*. *Clemens Alexandrinus* [*x*] obſerves, the ſame Reproach was alſo uſed by other Hereticks beſide the *Montaniſts*. And it appears from *Irenæus*, that this was an ancient Calumny of the *Valentinians*, who ſtiled themſelves the Spiritual and the Perfect, and the Orthodox the Secular and Carnal, [*y*] who had need of Abſtinence and Good Works, which were not neceſſary for them that were Perfect.

Sect. 15. Allegoriſts *by the* Millenaries.

The *Millenaries* ſtiled them *Allegoriſts*, becauſe they expounded the Prophecy of the Saints Reigning a Thouſand Years with Chriſt, *Rev.* 20. 4. to a Myſtical and Allegorical Senſe. Whence *Euſebius* (*z*) obſerves of *Nepos* the *Egyptian* Biſhop, who wrote for the *Millennium*, that he entituled his Book, Ἔλεγχος Ἀλληγορεισῶν, A Confutation of the *Allegoriſts*.

[*u*] Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 1. Nos quidem agnitio Paracleti diſjunxit à Pſychicis. Id. de Monogam. c. 1. Hæretici nuptias auferunt, Pſychici ingerunt. *See alſo* c. 11. *and* 16. [*w*] De Jejuniis adv. Pſychicos. De Pudicitia, *&c.* [*x*] Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. 4 p. 511. [*y*] Iren. Lib. 1. c. 1. p. 29. Nobis quidem, quos Pſychicos vocant, & de ſeculo eſſe dicunt, neceſſariam continentiam, *&c.* [*z*] Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 24.

Aetius

Sect. 16. Chronitæ *by the* Aetians; Simplices *by the* Manichees; Anthropolatræ *by the* Apollinarians.

Aetius the *Arian* gives them the abusive Name of Χρονίται; by which he seems to intimate, that their Religion was but Temporary, and would shortly have an end; when as the Character was much more applicable to the *Arians* themselves, whose Faith was so lately sprung up in the World; as the Author of the Dialogues *de Trinitate*, under the Name of *Athanasius*, who confutes *Aetius*, [*a*] justly retorts upon him.

The *Manichees*, as they gave themselves the most Glorious Names of *Electi*, *Macarii*, *Catharistæ*, mentioned by [*b*] St. *Austin*; so they reproached the Catholicks with the most contemptible Name of *Simplices*, Idiots; which is the Term that *Manichæus* himself used in his Dispute [*c*] with *Archelaus* the *Mesopotamian* Bishop, stiling the Christian Teachers, *Simpliciorum Magistros*, Guides of the Simple; because they could not relish his Execrable Doctrine concerning Two Principles of Good and Evil.

The *Apollinarians* were no less injurious to the Catholicks, in fixing on them the odious Name of *Anthropolatræ*, Man-Worshippers; because they maintained that Christ was a Perfect Man, and had a Reasonable Soul and Body, of the same Nature with ours; which *Apollinarius* denied. *Gregory Nazianzen* [*d*] takes notice of this Abuse, and sharply replies to it; telling the *Apollinarians*, that they themselves much better deserved the Name of *Sarcolatræ*, Flesh-Worshippers: For if Christ had no Human Soul, they must be concluded to worship his Flesh only.

[*a*] Athan. Dial. 2. de Trinit. T. 2. p. 193. [*b*] Aug. de Hær. c. 46. [*c*] Archel. Disp. adv. Manichæum ad calcem Sozomen. Ed. Vales. p. 197. [*d*] Naz. Ep. 1. ad Cledon.

The

Sect. 17. Philoſarcæ *and* Peluſiotæ, &c, *by the* Origenians.

The *Origenians*, who denied the Truth of the Reſurrection, and aſſerted that Men ſhould have only Aerial and Spiritual Bodies in the next World, made Jeſts upon the Catholicks, becauſe they maintain'd the contrary, That our Bodies ſhould be the ſame Individual Bodies, and of the ſame Nature that they are now, with Fleſh and Bones, and all the Members in the ſame Form and Structure, only alter'd in Quality, not in Subſtance. For this they gave them the opprobrious Names of *Simplices* and *Philoſarcæ* [*e*], Idiots, and Lovers of the Fleſh; *Carnei*, *Animales*, *Jumenta*, Carnal, Senſual, Animals; *Lutei*, Earthy; *Peluſiotes* [*f*], which is a Term of the ſame Importance, from the *Greek* Word, πηλος, *Lutum*, as St. *Jerom* himſelf (*) explains it. So that though *Baronius* from ſome Copies reads this Name, *Piloſiotæ*, yet the true Reading is *Peluſiotæ*, as the Paſſage cited in the Margin plainly evinces.

Sect. 18. *The Synagogue of* Antichriſt *and* Satan, *by the* Luciferians.

But of all others the *Luciferians* gave the Church the rudeſt Language; ſtiling her the Brothel-houſe, and Synagogue of *Antichriſt* and *Satan*; becauſe ſhe allow'd thoſe Biſhops to retain their Honour and Places, who were cajoled by the *Arians* to

[*e*] Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. T. 2. p. 171. Nos Simplices & Philoſarcas dicere, quod eadem Oſſa, & Sanguis, & Caro, id eſt, Vultus & Membra, totiuſque Compago corporis reſurgat in noviſſima die. [*f*] Id. Ep. 65. ad Pammach & Ocean. de Error. Orig. p. 192. Peluſiotas nos appellant, & Luteos, Animaleſque & Carneos, quod non recipiamus ea quæ Spiritus ſunt. [*] Id. Com. in Jerem. 29. p. 407. Quæ cum audiunt Diſcipuli ejus (Origenis) & Grunnianæ Familiæ Stercora, putant ſe Divina audire Myſteria: Noſque quòd iſta contemnimus, quaſi pro brutis habent animantibus, & vocant πηλοσιωτας, eo quod in Luto iſtius Corporis conſtituti, non poſſimus ſentire cœleſtia.

ſub-

ſubſcribe the fraudulent Confeſſion of the Council of *Ariminum*. The *Luciferian* in St. *Jerom* runs out in this manner againſt the Church; and St. *Jerom* ſays, he ſpake but the Senſe of the whole Party, for this was the ordinary Stile [*g*] and Language of all the reſt.

Theſe are ſome of thoſe Reproachful Names, which Hereticks concurring with *Jews* and Infidels, endeavoured to faſten upon the Chriſtian Church; which I ſhould not ſo much as have mentioned, but that they ſerve to give ſome Light to Antiquity, and therefore were not wholly to be paſſed over in a Treatiſe of this Nature.

CHAP. III.

Of the ſeveral Orders of Men in the Chriſtian Church.

Sect. 1. *Three ſorts of Members of the Chriſtian Church, the* Ἡγέμονοι, Πιστοὶ, *and* Κατηχέμενοι.

HAving given an Account of the ſeveral Names of Chriſtians, I proceed now to ſpeak of the Perſons, and ſeveral Orders of Men in the Chriſtian Church. Some divide them into Three Ranks, others into Four, others into Five; which yet come much to the ſame account, when they are compared together. *Euſebius* reckons but Three Orders, *viz.* the Ἡγέμονοι, Πιστοὶ, and Κατηχέμενοι; Rulers, Believers, and Catechumens. There are in every Church, ſays he, Three Orders of Men, [*h*] One of the Rulers or Guides, and Two of thoſe

[*g*] Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer. T. 2. p. 135. Aſſerebat univerſum mundum eſſe Diaboli: Et, ut jam familiare eſt eis dicere, factum de Eccleſia Lupanar---- Quod Antichriſti magis Synagoga, quàm Eccleſia Chriſti debeat nuncupari. [*h*] Euſeb. Demonſt. Evang. Lib. 7. c. 2. p. 323. Τείχη καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν τάγματα, ἓν μὲν τὸ τῶν ἡγεμόνων, δύο δὲ τὰ τῶν ὑποδεεστέρων.

that

that are ſubject to them: For the People are divided into Two Claſſes; the πιστοὶ, Believers, and the Unbaptized, by whom he means the Catechumens. St. *Jerom* [*i*] makes Five Orders; but then he divides the Clergy into Three Orders, to make up the Number; reckoning them thus, Biſhops, Presbyters, Deacons, Believers, and Catechumens. In which Account he follows *Origen*, who [*k*] makes Five Degrees ſubordinate to one another in the Church; ſaying, Every one ſhall be puniſhed according to the Difference of his Degree. If a Biſhop or Preſident of the Church ſins, he ſhall have the greater Puniſhment. A Catechumen will deſerve Mercy, in compariſon of a Believer; and a Layman, in compariſon of a Deacon; and a Deacon, in compariſon of a Presbyter. Here are plainly St. *Jerom*'s Five Orders; firſt Biſhops, under the Name of Preſidents of the Church; then Presbyters, after them Deacons; then Believers or Laymen; and laſt of all the Catechumens.

Sect. 2.
Believers here ſtrictly taken for the Laity that were baptized.

In all which Accounts, theſe Four Things are proper to be remarked. 1. That the Name, Believers, πιστοὶ, and *Fideles*, is here taken in a more ſtrict Senſe only for One Order of Chriſtians, The Believing or Baptized Laity, in Contradiſtinction to the Clergy and the Catechumens, the Two other Orders of Men in the Church. And in this Senſe,

[*i*] Hieron. Com. in Eſai. 19. p. 64. Quinq; Eccleſiæ Ordines, Epiſcopos, Presbyteros, Diaconos, Fideles, Catechumenos.

[*k*] Origen. Hom. 5. in Ezek. Pro modo graduum unuſquiſq; torquebitur. Majorem pœnam habet, qui Eccleſiæ præſidet & delinquit. Annon magis miſericordiam promeretur ad comparationem Fidelis, Catechumenus? Non magis venia dignus eſt Laicus, ſi ad Diaconum conferatur? Et rurſus comparatione Presbyteri Diaconus veniam plus meretur.

the

the Words Πιστοὶ and *Fideles* are commonly uſed in the ancient Liturgies [*l*] and Canons, to diſtinguiſh thoſe that were baptized, and allowed to partake of the Holy Myſteries, from the Catechumens. Whence came that ancient Diſtinction of the Service of the Church, into the *Miſſa Catechumenorum*, and *Miſſa* [*m*] *Fidelium*; of which more in its proper Place.

Sect. 3. *Catechumens owned as Imperfect Members of the Church.*

2*dly*. We may hence obſerve, that the Catechumens, though but Imperfect Chriſtians, were in ſome meaſure owned to be within the Pale of the Church. Foraſmuch as *Euſebius*, *Origen*, and St. *Jerom*, reckon them one of the Three Orders of the Church. And the Councils of *Eliberis* [*n*] and *Conſtantinople* [*o*] give them expreſly the Name of Chriſtians. Tho' as St. *Auſtin* [*p*] ſays, They were not yet Sons, but Servants: They belonged to the Houſe of God, but were not yet admitted to all the Privileges of it; being only Chriſtians at large, and not in the moſt ſtrict and proper Acceptation.

Sect. 4. *Hereticks not reckoned among Chriſtians.*

And yet this is more than can be ſaid of Hereticks properly ſo called. For we may obſerve, 3*dly*, That in the forementioned Diviſion, Hereticks come into no Account among Chriſtians. They were not eſteemed of, either as Catechumens, or Believers, but as mere *Jews*, or Pagans; neither having the true Faith, nor being willing to learn it. *Tertullian* [*q*] ſays in

[*l*] *See* Con. Nic. Can. 11. Con. Eliber. c. 12, 46, 51. Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 34. Cyril. Hieroſol. Præf. Catech. n. 2. [*m*] Con. Carth. 4. c. 84. Con. Valent. Hiſpan. c. 1. [*n*] Con. Elib. Can. 39. [*o*] Con. Conſt. 1. Can. 7. [*p*] Aug. Tract. 11. in Joh. T. 9. p. 41. Quod ſignum Crucis in fronte habent Catechumeni, jam de Domo magna ſunt, ſed fiant ex ſervis Filii. Non enim nihil ſunt, quia ad magnam Domum pertinent. [*q*] Tertul. de Præſcript. c. 37. Si Hæretici ſunt, Chriſtiani eſſe non poſſunt. gene-

general, If they be Hereticks, they cannot be Chriſtians. And St. *Jerom* [r] diſputing with a *Luciferian*, ſays the ſame in expreſs Terms, That Hereticks are no Chriſtians; nor to be ſpoken of, but as we would do of Heathens. *Lactantius* [s] ſpecifies in the *Montaniſts*, *Novatians*, *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Anthropians*, *Arians*, ſaying, That they are no Chriſtians, who forſaking the Name of Chriſt, call themſelves by other Denominations. *Athanaſius* [t] and *Hilary* [u] ſay the ſame of the *Arians*, That they are not Chriſtians. *Conſtantine* [w] therefore enacted it into a Law, That they ſhould not be called Chriſtians, but *Porphyrians*; from *Porphyry* that infamous Heathen, whoſe Practice they ſo much reſembled in their impious Blaſphemies and Reproaches of Chriſt and the Chriſtian Religion. And in Imitation of this, *Theodoſius* [x] Junior made another Law to the ſame Effect, againſt *Neſtorius* and his Followers; That they ſhould not abuſe the Name of Chriſtians; but be called *Simonians*, from *Simon Magus* the Arch Heretick. To which we may add that Decree of the General Council of *Sardica*, in their Synodical Epiſtle [y] againſt the *Arians*; where they require all Catholicks, not only to deny the *Arian*

[r] Hieron. Dial. c. Lucif. T. 2. p. 135. Hæretici Chriſtiani non ſunt - - - Igitur præfixum inter nos habemus, de Hæretico ſic loquendum ſicut de Gentili. [s] Lact. Inſtit. Libb. 4. c. 30.

[t] Athan. Orat. 2. adv. Arian. T. 1. p. 316. Ἀρειανοὶ ὄντες, οὐκ εἰσὶ χριστιανοί. [u] Hilar. ad Conſt. Lib. 1. p. 98. Chriſtianus ſum, non Arrianus. [w] Conſt. Imp. Ep. ad Epiſc. ap. Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 9. [x] Cod. Theod. Lib. 16. Tit. 5. de Hæret. c. 66. Damnato portentoſæ Superſtitionis Auctore Neſtorio, nota congrui nominis ejus inuratur Gregalibus, ne Chriſtianorum Appellatione abutantur: Sed quemadmodum Arriani Lege divæ memoriæ Conſtantini ob ſimilitudinem impietatis Porſyriani à Porfyrio nuncupantur; ſic ubiq; participes nefariæ Sectæ Neſtorii Simoniani vocentur. *See the ſame in the Acts of the General Council of* Epheſus, Part 3. c. 45. Con. Tom. 3. p. 1209. [y] Con. Sardic. Ep Synod. ap. Theod. Lib. 2. c. 8.

Biſhops

Biſhops the Title of Biſhops, but even that of Chriſtians. All which evidently proves, that the Ancients put a manifeſt Difference betwixt thoſe who were Apoſtates from the Faith, and thoſe who as yet had never made any ſolemn Profeſſion of their Faith in Baptiſm: They allowed the Catechumens the Name of Chriſtians, becauſe they were Candidates of Heaven; but they judged Hereticks unworthy of that Name, becauſe they corrupted the common Faith of Chriſtians and denied the Lord, by whoſe Name they were called.

Sect. 5. *Penitents and* Energumens *rank'd in the ſame Claſs with Catechumens.*

4. We may obſerve in the laſt place, that there were no Chriſtians, but what might be reduced to ſome one or other of the Three forementioned Orders: For the Penitents, and *Energumens*, as they called thoſe that were poſſeſſed with Evil Spirits, may be ranked among the Catechumens, being commonly treated and diſciplined by the Church in the ſame manner as they were, and placed in the ſame Claſs with them; and the Monks and other Aſceticks may be ranked under the common Head of Believers, though they had ſome peculiar Marks of Diſtinction in the Church. Yet I ſhall not confine my ſelf to ſpeak of all thoſe preciſely in this Order, and under theſe Heads, but give each a diſtinct and proper Place in this Diſcourſe; ſpeaking here only of Believers in general, as they ſtood diſtinguiſhed from the Catechumens and the Clergy of the Church, and treating of the reſt as occaſion ſhall require in the following parts of this Diſcourſe.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

A more particular Account of the Πιστοὶ, *or Believers; Their Titles of Honour and Privileges above the Catechumens.*

Sect. 1. *Believers otherwiſe called* φωτιζόμενοι, *the Illuminate.*

THE πιστοὶ, or *Fideles*, being ſuch as were baptized, and thereby made compleat and perfect Chriſtians, were upon that account dignified with ſeveral Titles of Honour and Marks of Diſtinction above the Catechumens. They were hence called φωτιζόμενοι, The Illuminate: So the Council of *Laodicea* [z] terms thoſe that were newly Baptized, πεφωτάτως φωτισθέντας. And *Jobius* [a] in *Photius*, οἱ φωτιζόμενοι. As St. *Paul* himſelf in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* twice uſes the Word illuminate for Baptized, in the Opinion of moſt [b] Interpreters. The Reaſon of the Name is given by *Juſtin Martyr*, who ſays [c] they were ſo called, becauſe their Underſtandings were enlightned by the Knowledge that was conſequent to Baptiſm. For all the Myſteries of Religion were unveiled to the Baptized, which were kept ſecret from the Catechumens: And ſometimes alſo Baptiſm was attended with extraordinary Illuminations of the Holy Ghoſt, as in thoſe whom St. *Paul* cauſed to be Baptized at *Epheſus*: Act. 19. 6. *They ſpake with Tongues and propheſied.*

[z] Con. Laodic. Can. 3. [a] Phot. Cod. 222. p. 595. & 598. [b] *See* Grot. Hamond. Eſtius in Heb. 6. 4. & 10. 32. [c] Juſtin. Apol. 2. p. 94.

2. They

Sect. 2. *And οἱ μεμυημένοι, the Initiated.*

2. They were hence alſo ſtiled, οἱ μεμυημένοι, which the *Latins* call *Initiati*, the Initiated; that is, Admitted to the Uſe of the Sacred Offices, and Knowledge of the Sacred Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion. Hence came that Form of Speaking, ſo frequently uſed by St. *Chryſoſtom* and other ancient Writers [*d*] when they touched upon any Doctrines or Myſteries which the Catechumens underſtood not, ἴσασιν οἱ μεμυημένοι, The Initiated know what is ſpoken. St. *Ambroſe* writes a Book to theſe [*e*] *Initiati*. *Iſidore* [*f*] of *Peluſium*, and *Heſychius* [*g*] call them μυσταὶ, and others μυσταγώγητοι: Whence the Catechumens have the contrary Names, Ἄμυστοι, Ἀμύητοι, and Ἀμυσταγώγητοι; The Uninitiated, or Unbaptized.

Sect. 3. *And τέλειοι, The Perfect.*

3. Believers were otherwiſe called τέλειοι, and τετελειώμενοι, The Perfect, becauſe they were Conſummate Chriſtians, who had a Right to participate of the Holy Euchariſt; the τὸ τέλειον, as it is frequently called in the Canons [*h*] of the Ancient Councils; where ὅτι τὸ τέλειον ἐλθεῖν, and τῶ τελείῳ μετέχειν, always ſignify Participation of the Holy Euchariſt, that Sacred Myſtery that unites us to Chriſt, and gives us the moſt Conſummate Perfection that we are capable of in this World.

Sect. 4. Chari Dei, Filii Dei, Ἅγιοι, &c.

4. *Tertullian* adds to theſe the Name of *Chari Dei*, The Favourites of Heaven; becauſe their Prayers and Interceſſions were powerful with God, to obtain Pardon for others,

[*d*] Caſaubon Exerc. 16. in Baron. p. 399. *obſerves this Phraſe occurr no leſs than* 50 *times in St.* Chryſoſtom *and St.* Auſtin. [*e*] Ambroſ. De his qui initiantur Myſteriis. [*f*] Iſidor. lib. 4. Ep. 162. ἴσασιν οἱ μυσταὶ τὸ λεγόμενον. [*g*] Heſych. voce μυσταὶ. [*h*] Con. Ancyran. Can. 4, 5, 6, &c.

that ſhould addreſs Heaven by them. Therefore, in his Inſtructions to the Penitents, he bids them, *Charis Dei adgeniculari*, fall down at the Feet of thoſe Favourites, and commend their Suit to all the Brethren, deſiring them to intercede with God for them. *Tertul. de Pœnit.* c. 9.

All theſe Names (and many others that might be added, which are obvious to every Reader, ſuch as Saints, and Sons of God, *&c.*) were peculiar Titles of Honour and Reſpect given only to thoſe who were Πιστοὶ, or Believers.

Sect. 5. *The Privileges of the* Fideles. - 1. *To partake of the Euchariſt.*

And hence it was, that correſpondent to theſe Names, the *Fideles* had their peculiar Privileges in the Church, above the Catechumens. For, Firſt, it was their ſole Prerogative to partake of the Lord's Table, and Communicate with one another in the Symbols of Chriſt's Body and Blood at the Altar. Hither none came, but ſuch as were firſt initiated by Baptiſm. Whence the Cuſtom was, before they went to celebrate the Euchariſt, for a Deacon to proclaim Ἅγια ἁγίοις, Holy Things for Holy Men: Ye Catechumens go forth, [*i*] as the Author of the Conſtitutions, and St. *Chryſoſtom* and ſome others word it.

Sect. 6. 2. *To join in all the Prayers of the Church.*

2. Another of their Prerogatives above Catechumens, was, to ſtay and join with the Miniſter in all the Prayers of the Church; which the Catechumens were not allowed to do. For in the Ancient Service of the Church, there were no Prayers preceding the Communion-Office; but only ſuch as particularly rela-

[*i*] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 8. *and* 12. Chryſoſt. Hom. in Parab. de Filio Prodig. Tom. 6. μὴ τὶς τῶν κατηχουμένων, &c.

ted,

ted, either to the ſeveral Claſſes of Penitents, or the *Energumeni*, that is, Perſons poſſeſſed with evil Spirits, or the Catechumens themſelves. When theſe Prayers were ended, the Catechumens and all others were commanded to withdraw, and then began the Communion-Service at the Altar; where none were admitted ſo much as to be Spectators, ſave thoſe who were to Communicate in the Euchariſt. For to join in Prayers and Participation of the Euchariſt, were then Privileges of the ſame Perſons; and no one was qualify'd for the Prayers of the Church, that was not qualify'd for the Communion.

Sect. 7.

3. The Uſe of the Lord's Prayer another Prerogative of the Πιςοὶ: *VVhence it was called* ἐυχὴ πιςῶν, *The Prayer of Believers.*

3. More particularly, the Uſe of the Lord's-Prayer was the ſole Prerogative of the Πιςοὶ, or Believers. For then it was no Crime, or Argument of Weakneſs, or Want of the Spirit, to uſe it; but an Honour and Privilege of the moſt Conſummate and Perfect Chriſtians. The Catechumens were not allowed to ſay, *Our Father*, till they had firſt made themſelves Sons by Regeneration in the Waters of Baptiſm. This is expreſly ſaid by St. *Chryſoſtom* [*k*], St. *Auſtin* [*l*], *Theodoret* [*m*], and ſeveral others. And for this Reaſon, *Chryſoſtom* [*n*] calls it ἐυχὴ πιςῶν; and St. *Auſtin* [*o*] *Oratio Fidelium*, The Prayer of the Regenerate, or Believers; becauſe it was their Privilege and Birth-right: It was given to them as their Property, he [*p*] ſays, and therefore they made uſe of it;

[*k*] Chryſoſt. Hom. 2. in 2 Cor. p. 740. [*l*] Aug. Hom. 9. de Verb. Apoſt. [*m*] Theodor. Epit. Div. Dogm. c. 24. [*n*] Chryſoſt. Hom. 10. in Coloſ. p. 1385. [*o*] Aug. Enchirid. c. 71. [*p*] Aug. Com. in Pſal. 142. Orabant utique jam Fideles, jam Apoſtoli. Nam iſta Oratio Dominica magis Fidelibus datur. Id

it; having a Right to say, *Our Father which art in Heaven*, who were born again to such a Father, by Water and the Holy Ghost.

Sect. 8.

4 They were admitted to hear Discourses upon the most profound Mysteries of Religion.

4. Lastly, They were admitted to be Auditors of all Discourses made in the Church, even those that treated of the most abstruse Points, and profound Mysteries of the Christian Religion; which the Catechumens were strictly prohibited from Hearing. The Catechumens were allowed to hear the Scriptures, and the ordinary popular Discourses that were made upon them; which was no more than what some Councils [*q*] allow even to *Jews* and *Gentiles*: For in those Discourses they never treated plainly of their Mysteries, but in such a Covert way, as the Catechumens could not understand them. But when the Catechumens were dismissed, then they discoursed more openly of their Mysteries before the *Fideles*, whose Privilege it was to be the sole Auditors of such Discourses. This we learn from St. *Ambrose*; [*r*] who says, His common Discourses to the Unbaptized, were only upon Points of Morality; but when they were Baptized, then was the time to open to them the Mysteries and Sa-

Id Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 71. De quotidianis, brevibus, levibusq; peccatis - - - - quotidiana Oratio Fidelium satisfacit. Eorum est enim dicere, Pater noster qui es in Cœlis; qui jam Patri tali regenerati sunt, ex aqua, & Spiritu Sancto.

[*q*] Con. Carthag. 4. Can. 84. Ut Episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi Ecclesiam, & audire Verbum Dei, sive Gentilem, sive Hæreticum, sive Judæum, usque ad Missam Catechumenorum. [*r*] Ambrof. de his qui Mysteriis initiantur, c. 1. De Moralibus quotidianum Sermonem habuimus. - - - - Nunc de Mysteriis dicere tempus admonet, atq; ipsam Sacramentorum rationem edere, quam ante Baptismum si putassemus insinuandam nondum initiatis, prodidisse potius quam edidisse æstimaremur.

crament

craments of Religion: To have discoursed to them of those Things before, had been more like Exposing Mysteries, than Explaining them. St. *Austin* speaks to the same purpose, in one of his Sermons [s] to the newly Baptized: Having now dismissed the Catechumens, says he, we have retained you only to be our Hearers: Because, beside those Things which belong to all Christians in common, we are now to discourse more particularly of the Heavenly Mysteries, or Sacraments; which none are qualify'd to hear, but such as by God's Gift are made Partakers of them. And therefore ye ought to hear them with the greater Reverence, by how much more sublime those Doctrines are, which are committed only to the Baptized and Believing Auditors, than those which the Catechumens also are wont to hear. *Theodoret* [t] takes notice of the same Distinction made in their Discourses, according to the Difference of their Auditors; saying, We discourse obscurely of Divine Mysteries before the Unbaptized; but when they are departed, we speak plainly to the Baptized. From all which it is evident, that the *Fideles* were singled out, as the only proper Auditors fit to hear Discourses upon the sublime Doctrines and Mysteries of Religion. And in these and the like Privileges, consisted their Prerogative above the Catechumens.

[s] Aug. Serm. 1. ad Neophytos in Append. T. 10. p. 845. Dimissis jam Catechumenis, vos tantum ad audiendum retinuimus: Quia præter illa, quæ omnes Christianos convenit in commune servare, specialiter de cœlestibus Mysteriis locuturi sumus, quæ audire non possunt, nisi qui ea donante jam Domino perceperunt. Tanto ergo majore reverentia debetis audire quæ dicimus, quanto majora ista sunt, quæ solis Baptizatis & Fidelibus Auditoribus committuntur; quàm illa quæ etiam Catechumeni audire consueverunt. [t] Theod. Quæst. 15. in Num.

CHAP. V.

Of the Distinction betwixt the Laity and Clergy; and of the Antiquity of that Distinction.

Sect. 1. *The* Fideles *otherwise called* Laici, *to distinguish them from the Clergy.*

WE have hitherto considered the Great Body of the Christian Church, the *Fideles*, as opposed to the Catechumens: We are now to view them in another Relation, as contradistinct to the Clergy: In which Relation they went by other Names; such as those of *Laici*, Laymen; Βιωτικοὶ, Seculars; Ἰδιῶται, Private Men. The most common and Ancient Name, was that of *Laici*; which every where occurs in the Writings of *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and *Tertullian*, and others of the Third Century: Which is a thing so evident, that the greatest Enemies of this Distinction, *Rigaltius* [u], *Salmasius*, and *Selden*, do not pretend to dispute it; but only say, There was originally no such Distinction in the Church; but that it is a Novelty, and owing to the Ambition of the Clergy of the Third Century, in which *Cyprian* and *Tertullian* lived.

Sect. 2. *The Antiquity of this Distinction proved against* Rigaltius, Salmasius, *and* Selden.

This Accusation reflects highly upon St. *Cyprian*, and other Holy Martyrs his Contemporaries; who were as far from the Ambition that is charged upon them, as the Authors are from Truth, that bring the Charge. For indeed the Distinction was none of their inventing; but derived from the *Jewish* Church, and adopted into the Christian by the

[u] Rigalt. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 3.

Apo-

Apoſtles themſelves. *Clemens Alexandrinus* [w] ſpeaking of St. *John*, ſays, That after his Return from Baniſhment in the Iſle of *Patmos*, he ſettled at *Epheſus*; whence being often invited to viſit the Neighbouring Regions, he Ordained them Biſhops, and ſet apart ſuch Men for the Clergy, as were ſignify'd to him by the Holy Ghoſt. Whence it appears, that the Name Κλῆρος, Clergy, was always a peculiar Title of thoſe that were ſet apart for the Miniſtry and Service of God. And that this Diſtinction came from the *Jewiſh* Church, is evident from what *Clemens Romanus* [x] ſays of the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy; That as the High-Prieſt had his Office aſſigned him, and the Prieſts alſo their proper Station, and the *Levites* their peculiar Service; ſo Laymen in like manner were under the Obligation of Precepts proper for Laymen. Theſe Inſtances evidently prove, that a Diſtinction was always obſerved in theſe Names, Laity and Clergy, from the firſt Foundation of the Chriſtian Church.

Sect. 3. *An Objection from* 1 Pet. 5. 3. *anſwer'd.*

There is but one Objection of any Moment againſt this: Which is taken from the Words of St. *Peter*; where he bids the Elders of the Church not lord it over God's Heritage. The Original is, μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων; which (as ſome Learned [y] Criticks obſerve) may as well ſignify the Poſſeſſions of the Church, as the People. But admit that it means the People; this is no more than is ſaid of the People of *Iſrael*, who are called God's κλῆρος, and λαὸς ἔγκληρος, his Inheritance or his Clergy; *Deut.* 4. 20. 9. 29. As both the *Jews*

[w] Clem. Alexand. Quis Dives ſalvetur. ap. Combefiſ. Auctar. Noviſſ. p. 185. & ap. Euſeb. Lib. 3. c. 23. Κλήρῳ ἔναγε τινα κλήρων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαινομένων. [x] Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. ad Corinth. n. 40. ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται. [y] Dodwel. Diſſert. 1. in Cyprian.

and Christians were, in opposition to the Heathen: Notwithstanding which, God had his peculiar Κλῆρος among his own People, who were his Lot or Inheritance, and distinguished by that Name from the *Laici*, or remaining Body of the People. As we have observed before in the Name Πιστοὶ, *Fideles*, or Believers; all Persons within the Pale of the Church were called Believers, in opposition to Infidels and Pagans; but when they would distinguish one Order of Men in the Church from another, then the Name Believers was given peculiarly to such as were Baptized, and the rest were called Catechumens: So here, all Christian People are God's Κλῆρος, his Lot, his Inheritance, or his Clergy: But when his Ministers are to be distinguished from the rest of the People in the Church, then the Name *Clerici*, or Clergy, was their appropriate Title, and the Name of the other, Laymen.

Sect. 4. *A Distinction in the Offices of Laity and Clergy always observed.*

And this Observation will help to set another sort of Persons right, who confound not only the Names, but the Offices of Laity and Clergy together; and plead that originally there was no Distinction between them. The Name of Priesthood, indeed, is sometimes given in common to the whole Body of Christian People; 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *Rev.* 1. 6. but so it was to the *Jewish* People, *Exod.* 19. 6. *Ye shall be unto me a Kingdom of Priests, and an Holy Nation.* Yet every one knows, that the Offices of the Priests and *Levites* among the *Jews*, were very distinct from those of the common People, not by Usurpation, but by God's Appointment. And so it was among Christians, from the first Foundation of the Church. Wheresoever any Number of Converts were made, as soon as they were capable of being formed into an Organical Church; a Bishop, or a Pres-

Presbyter, with a Deacon, was ordained to minister to them, as *Epiphanius* [z] delivers from the ancient Histories of the Church. The same may be observed in the forementioned Passage of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, where he says St. *John* ordained Bishops and other Clergy, in the Churches which he regulated, by the Direction of the Holy Ghost. Hence it is that *Ignatius* so frequently in all his Epistles, charges the People to do nothing without the Bishops [a], Presbyters and Deacons. *Tertullian* [b] says it was customary among Hereticks to confound the Offices of Clergy and Laity together: They made one a Bishop to Day, and another To-morrow; To Day a Deacon, and To-morrow a Reader; To Day a Presbyter, and To-morrow a Layman. For Laymen among them performed the Offices of the Priesthood. But this was not the Custom of the Catholick Church. For as St. *Jerom* [c] observes, They reckoned that to be no Church, which had no Priests. They were of no Esteem with them, who were both Laymen and Bishops together. And by this we may judge how ingenuously they deal with St. *Jerom* and *Tertullian*, who alledge their Authorities to prove that every Christian is as much a Priest as another. St. *Jerom* indeed says [d] there is a Laical Priesthood; but then he explains himself to mean no more by that, than Christian Baptism, whereby we are made Kings and Priests to God.

[z] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Aerian. n. 5. [a] Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 6, & 7. Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. Ep. ad Philad. n. 7.

[b] Tertul. de Præscript. c. 41. Alius hodie Episcopus, cras alius: Hodie Diaconus, qui cras Lector: Hodie Presbyter, qui cras Laicus. Nam & Laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.

[c] Hieron. Dial. c. Lucifer. T. 2. p. 145. Ecclesia non est quæ non habet Sacerdotes. Ibid. Omissis paucis homunculis, qui ipsi sibi & Laici sunt, & Episcopi. [d] Hieron. ibid. p. 136. Sacerdotium Laici, id est, Baptisma. Scriptum est enim, Regnum & Sacerdotes nos fecit, &c.

And

And *Tertullian* [*e*] grants no other Prieſthood to Laymen, ſave that they may baptize in caſe of abſolute Neceſſity, when none of the Eccleſiaſtical Order can be had; which was according to the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church; but does by no means confound the Offices of Laity and Clergy together, unleſs any one can think Caſes Ordinary and Extraordinary all one. The Ancient Hiſtorians [*f*], *Socrates* and *Ruffin* tell us, That *Frumentius* and *Ædeſius*, Two young Men, who had no External Call or Commiſſion to preach the Goſpel, being carried Captive into *India*, Converted the Nation, and ſettled ſeveral Churches among them. And the ſame *Socrates* [*g*] and *Theodoret* ſay, That the *Iberians* were firſt Converted by a Captive Woman, who made the King and Queen of the Nation Preachers of the Goſpel to their People. Yet a Man would argue very weakly, that ſhould hence conclude, That therefore there was no Diſtinction betwixt Clergy and Laity in the Primitive Church; or that Laymen might Preach without a Call, and Women Ordain Miniſters of the Goſpel. The Author of the Comments upon St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, under the Name [*h*] of St. *Ambroſe*, ſeems to ſay indeed, that at firſt all Chriſt's Diſciples were Clergy, and had all a general Commiſſion to preach the Goſpel and Baptize;

[*e*] Tertul. Exhort. ad Caſt. c. 7. Nonne & Laici Sacerdotes ſumus? Scriptum eſt, Regnum quoq; nos & Sacerdotes Deo & Patri ſuo fecit——Ubi Eccleſiaſtici Ordinis eſt Conſeſſus; & offert & tinguit Sacerdos, qui eſt ibi, ſolus. Sed ubi tres, Eccleſia eſt; licet Laici. [*f*] Ruffin. Lib. 1. c. 9. Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 19. [*g*] Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 20. Ἀμφότεροι κήρυκες τῦ χειστῦ, &c. Theodor. Lib 1. c. 23. [*h*] Ambroſ. ſive Hilar. Diacon. Com. in Eph. 4. p. 948. Ut creſceret Plebs & multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia conceſſum eſt & evangelizare, & baptizare & Scripturas in Eccleſia explanare. At ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa eſt Eccleſia, Conventicula conſtituta ſunt, & Rectores & cætera Officia in Eccleſiis ſunt ordinata, ut nullus de Clero auderet, qui ordinatus non eſſet, præſumere Officium quod ſciret non ſibi creditum. But

But that was in order to Convert the World, and before any Multitude of People were gathered, or Churches founded, wherein to make a Diſtinction. But as ſoon as the Church began to ſpread it ſelf over the World, and ſufficient Numbers were Converted to form themſelves into a Regular Society, then Rulers and other Eccleſiaſtical Officers were appointed among them, and a Diſtinction made, That no one, no, not of the Clergy themſelves, might preſume to meddle with any Office not committed to him, and to which he knew himſelf not Ordained. So that for ought that appears to the contrary, we may conclude, that the Names and Offices of Laymen and Clergy were always diſtinct from one another, from the firſt Foundation of Chriſtian Churches.

Sect. 5. *Laymen alſo called* Βιωτικοὶ, *Seculars.*

The Laymen were diſtinguiſhed alſo by the Name of Βιωτικοὶ, Seculars, from Βίος, which ſignifies a Secular Life. And by this Title they are diſcerned not only from the Clergy, but alſo from the Aſceticks and thoſe of a more retired Life, who bid adieu to the World, and disburdened themſelves of all Secular Cares and Buſineſs. Thus St. *Chryſoſtom* [*i*] exhorting all Men to read the Scriptures, ſays, Let no Man think to excuſe himſelf by ſaying, I am a Secular, ἀνὴρ βιωτικὸς, It belongs not to me to read the Scriptures, but to thoſe that have retired from the World, and have taken up their Abode in the Tops of the Mountains. And in another place, commenting on thoſe Words of St. *Paul*, *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher Powers*; he ſays, This Command is given to the Clergy, and to the Monks, and not to the Seculars [*ii*] only. And ſo

[*i*] Chryſ. Hom. 3. in Laz. T. 5. [*ii*] Chryſ. Hom. 23. in Rom. ταῦτα διατάτεται ἱερεῦσι, καὶ μοναχοῖς, καὶ τοῖς βιωτικοῖς μόνοις.

they

they are ſtiled in the in the Author [*k*] who goes under the Name of *Juſtin Martyr*, and others.

Sect. 6. *And* ἰδιῶται, *Private Men.*

In ſome Writers they are termed ἰδιῶται, Private Men, as being only in a Private Capacity, and not acting as Publick Miniſters. So it was another Name to diſtinguiſh them from the Clergy who were in the Publick Office and Employment of the Church. St. *Chryſoſtom* [*l*] and *Theodoret* [*m*] ſay the word ἰδιώτης is ſo uſed by St. *Paul* himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 14. 16. which we tranſlate, Unlearned; but they ſay it ſignifies no more than a Layman, or one in a Private Capacity, whether Learned or Unlearned, who is not a Publick Miniſter of the Church. And ſo *Origen* alſo uſes the the Name ἰδιῶται, not for Perſons Unlearned, but for Laymen, who had Power as well as other Chriſtians to caſt out Devils in the Name of Chriſt [*n*]. And *Syneſius* oppoſes the Names, ἰδιῶται, and ἱερεῖς, to one another, making [*o*] the one to denote thoſe who miniſtred in the Sacred Service of the Church; and the other, thoſe who had no ſuch Office, but ſerved God only in a private Capacity, as Laymen. Whence alſo ſpeaking of ſome Clergymen who deſerved to be Degraded, he ſays [*p*] they were to be treated publickly by all, ὡς ἄνθρωπους ἰδιώτας, as mere Private Men, that is, no longer as Clergymen, but Laymen. Whence we may collect, that this was a common Name for all ſuch as had no publick Office or Miniſtry in the Church.

[*k*] Juſt. M. Reſp. ad Quæſt. 19. τῷ βιωτικῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, &c.
[*l*] Chryſ. Hom. 35. in 1 Cor. 14 ἰδιώτην ἢ λαϊκὸν λέγει.
[*m*] Theod. Com. in 1 Cor. 14. 16. ἰδιώτην καλεῖ τὸν ἐν τῷ λαϊκῷ τάγματι τεταγμένον. [*n*] Orig. c. Celſ. Lib. 7. p. 334.
[*o*] Syneſ. Ep. 54. ad Theoph. p. 144. [*p*] Syneſ. Ep. 67. p. 259.

On

Sect. 7. *What Persons properly called* Clerici.

On the other Hand, all Persons who had any Publick Employment in the Church, were called by the common Name of *Clerici*; which Name at first was given only to the Three Superior Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, because there were then no other Orders in the Church. But in the Third Century many Inferior Orders were appointed, as subservient to the Deacons Office, such as Sub-Deacons, Acolythists, Readers, *&c.* And then those also had the common Name of *Clerici* too, having no farther Concern with Secular Affairs, but wholly attending the Service of the Church. St. *Cyprian* always gives these the Name of *Clerici* [*q*]: As where he speaks of *Optatus* a Sub-Deacon, and *Saturus* a Reader, he Stiles them both *Clerici*. The Ordinations of such he [*r*] calls *Ordinationes Clericæ*. And hence the Letters which he had occasion to send to Foreign Parts by their Hands, had the Name of *Literæ* [*s*] *Clericæ*. *Lucian* the Martyr, and *Cyprian*'s Contemporary, speaks in the same Stile concerning Exorcists [*t*] and Readers.

The Council of *Nice* it self [*u*] gives the Appellation of κληρος to others besides Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. And the Third Council of *Carthage* made a Canon [*w*] on purpose to confirm the Title to them.

[*q*] Cypr. Ep. 24. al. 29. ed. Ox. Quoniam oportuit me per Clericos Scribere, &c. feciſſe me ſciatis Lectorem Saturum, & Hypodiaconum Optatum. [*r*] Id. Ep. 33. al. 38. [*s*] *See* Bell Not. in Cypr. Ep. 23. [*t*] Lucian. Ep. 17. al. 23. ap. Cypr. Præſente de Clero, & Exorciſta & Lectore, Lucianus ſcriſit. [*u*] Con. Nic. Can. 3. [*w*] Con. Carth. 3. can. 1. Clericorum nomen etiam Lectores & Pſalmiſtæ & Oſtiarii retineant.

Yea,

Sect. 8. *The Name* Clerici *ſometimes appropriate to the Inferior Orders.*

Yea, the ſame Council [x] ſeems rather to appropriate the Name *Clerici* to the Inferior Orders, by way of Diſtinction from the Superior, firſt naming Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, and then the *Clerici*, or Clerks; that is, the Inferior Orders. And the ſame is done by St. *Ambroſe* [y] and *Hilary* [z] under his Name, more expreſly, who ſpeak of the *Clerici* as diſtinct from the Deacons. As alſo *Epiphanius* [a] who ſpeaking of thoſe that lapſed in *Egypt* in the *Diocletian* Perſecution, he ſays, ſome of them were Soldiers, ſome Clerks of divers Orders, ſome Presbyters, and ſome Deacons. Where the *Clerici* are ſpoken of as diſtinct from Presbyters and Deacons. And ſo in the Council of *Laodicea* [b] and many other Places.

Sect. 9. *The Reaſon of the Name* Clerici.

As to the Reaſon of the Name *Clerici* and *Clerus*, St. *Jerom* [c] rightly obſerves, that it comes from the *Greek* Κλῆρος, which ſignifies a Lot; and thence he ſays, God's Miniſters were called *Clerici*, either becauſe they are the Lot and Portion of the Lord, or becauſe the Lord is their Lot, that is, their Inheritance. Others [d] think ſome regard was had to the ancient Cuſtom of

[x] Con. Carth. 3. c. 15. Placuit ut Epiſcopi, & Presbyteri, & Diaconi, vel Clerici non ſint Conductores. [y] Ambr. de Dignit. Sacerd. c. 3. Aliud eſt quod ab Epiſcopo requirit Deus, aliud quod à Presbytero, & aliud quod à Diacono, & aliud quod à Clerico, & aliud quod à Laico. [z] Pſeud-Amb. in Eph. 4. Nunc neque Diaconi in Populo prædicant, neque Clerici vel Laici baptizant. [a] Epiphan. Her. 68. Melet. [b] Con. Laodic. can. 20. [c] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad. Nepot. Cleros græcè, Sors Latinè appellatur: propterea vocantur Clerici, vel quia de Sorte ſunt Domini, vel quia ipſe Dominus Sors, id eſt, Pars Clericorum eſt. [d] Dodwel. Diſſert. 1. in. Cypr. §. 15.

chuſing

chuſing Perſons into Sacred Offices by Lot, both among *Jews* and *Gentiles*; which is not improbable, though that Cuſtom never generally prevailed among Chriſtians, as ſhall be ſhewed hereafter.

Sect. 10. *All the Clergy called* Canonici.

There is another Name for the Clergy, very commonly to be met with in the ancient Councils, which is that of *Canonici*, a Name derived from the *Greek* Word Κανὼν, which ſignifies among other things, the Roll or Catalogue of every Church, wherein the Names of all the Eccleſiaſticks were written, and which was as it were the Rule of knowing to what Church they belonged. In this Senſe the Word Κανὼν is often uſed by the Council [e] of *Nice*. The Council of *Antioch* [f] calls it ἅγιον Κανών, the Sacred Roll, the Apoſtolical Canons, καταλογος ἱερατικὸς [g] the Catalogue of the Clergy. Which is the ſame that *Sidonius Apollinaris* [h] calls *Albus*; and the Council of *Agde* [i] by the Name of *Matricula*; and St. *Auſtin* [k], *Tabula Clericorum*. Now becauſe the Names of all the Clergy were enrolled in this Catalogue or Canon, they were hence called *Canonici*. As in St. *Cyril* [l] κανονικῶν παρουσία ſignifies the Preſence of the Clergy. And κανονικοὶ ψαλται in the Council of *Laodicea* [m] ſignifies ſuch of the Clergy as were ordered to ſing in the Church. And ſo generally in the Councils of *Nice* [n] and *Antioch*, οἱ ἐν τῷ κανόνι, is put to denote the Clergy of the Church. And upon the ſame Account all others, whoſe Names were ſet down in the Churches Books,

[e] Con. Nic. Can. 16, 17, 19. [f] Con. Antioch. c. 1. [g] Can. Apoſtol. c. 13, 14, 15, 50, &c. [h] Sidon. Lib. 6. Ep. 8. Nomen Lectorum Albus nuper excepit. [i] Con. Agathenſ. can. 2. Reſcripti in Matricula gradum ſuum dignitatemque ſuſcipiant. [k] Aug. Hom. 50. de Diverſis. T. 10. p. 523. Deleto eum de Tabula Clericorum. [l] Cyril. Præf. Catech. n. 3. [m] Con. Laodic. Can. 15. [n] Con. Antioch. Can. 2 & 6. Con. Nic. Can. 16, & 17.

to

to entitle them to receive Maintenance from the Church, were called by the ſame Name, *Canonici*, ſuch as the Monks, Virgins, Widows, *&c.* whom St. *Baſil* [o] ſpeaks of under this Name, as *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* underſtand him.

Sect. 11. *And* Τάξις τῦ Βήματος, *The Order of the Sanctuary.*

I paſs over many other Names of the Clergy, which are obvious to every Reader; ſuch as that of Eccleſiaſticks, and ἱερατικοὶ, or τάξις ἱερατικὴ, the Holy Order, *&c.* And ſhall but take notice of one more, which rarely occurs any where but in *Gregory Nazianzen*, who gives the Clergy, eſpecially the Superior Clergy, the Name of Τάξις τῦ Βήματος, The Order of the Sanctuary [p]. Which Name was given them from their Privilege of entring into that Part of the Church where the Altar ſtood which (as we ſhall ſee when we come to ſpeak of Churches) was called Βῆμα or ἱερατεῖον, The Sanctuary. Hither none might come but the Clergy, who were therefore called the Order of the Sanctuary. Whence in the ſame Author [q] τῦ βήματι προάγειν, ſignifies to give a Man Ordination, or make him a Clergyman: And ὁ ἀπὸ βήματος, is one of the Sacred Order [r], or one of the Clergy.

---

[o] Baſil. Ep. Canonic. c. 6. [p] Naz. Orat. 20. in Laud. Baſil p. 336. [q] Id. Orat. 19. de Fun. Patr. [r] Naz. Orat. 19. p. 310, & 311. Orat. 20. p. 351.

BOOK II.

Of the ſeveral Orders of the Clergy in the Primitive Church.

CHAP. I.

Of the Original of Biſhops: And that they were a diſtinct Order from Presbyters in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 1. *What the Ancients mean by different Orders of Biſhops and Presbyters.*

WE have hitherto conſidered the Clergy in general, as diſtinct from the Laity, and come now to examine by what Names or Offices they were diſtinguiſhed from one another. And here the moſt ancient Diſtinction that occurs, is that of the Superior Clergy into the Three diſtinct Orders of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons. That there were no other Orders in the Church but theſe Three at firſt, will be evidenced in its proper Place, when I come to give an Account of the firſt Riſe and Original of the Inferior Orders; and that Deacons were always a Sacred and Standing Order, will be proved likewiſe when I ſpeak particularly of them: Here then it remains that our Enquiry be made only into the Diſtinction betwixt the Orders of Biſhops and Presbyters. And this, ſo far as concerns Matter of Fact, and the Practice of the Church (which is the

thing I have undertaken to give an Account of) will be moſt fairly and fully reſolved, by conſidering only theſe Three Things. 1. That the Ancient Writers of the Church always ſpeak of theſe as diſtinct Orders. 2. That they derive the Original of Biſhops from Divine Authority, and Apoſtolical Conſtitution. 3. That they give us particular Accounts and Catalogues of ſuch Biſhops as were firſt Settled and Conſecrated, in the new-founded Churches, by the Hands of the Apoſtles.

But before I proceed to the Proof of theſe things, I muſt premiſe one Particular, to avoid all Ambiguity; That I take the Word *Order* in that Senſe as the Ancients uſe it, and not as many of the Schoolmen do, who for Reaſons of their own diſtinguiſh between Order and Juriſdiction, and make Biſhops and Presbyters to be one and the ſame Order, only differing in Power and Juriſdiction. This Diſtinction was unknown to the Ancients; among whom the Words, Order, Degree, Office, Power and Juriſdiction, when they ſpeak of the Superiority of Biſhops above Presbyters, mean but one and the ſame thing, *viz.* The Power of the Supreme Governors of the Church, conferred upon them in their Ordination, over Presbyters, who are to do nothing but in Subordination to them. St. *Jerom*, who will be allowed to ſpeak the Senſe of the Ancients, makes no difference in theſe Words, *Ordo*, *Gradus*, *Officium*, but uſes them promiſcuouſly to ſignifie the Power and Juriſdiction of Biſhops above Presbyters and the whole Church, which is, properly ſpeaking, the very Eſſence of their Order. Therefore ſometimes he calls them different Orders, as in his Book againſt *Jovinian* [*s*] where he ſays, that

[*s*] Hieron. cont. Jovin. Lib. 2. p. 89. In veteri Teſtamento & in Novo alium Ordinem Pontifex tenet, alium Sacerdotes, alium Levitæ.

both

both in the Old and New Teſtament the High-Prieſts are one Order, the Prieſts another, and the *Levites* another. So in his Epiſtles [*t*] to *Ruſticus*, and *Fabiola* [*u*], where he joins *Ordo* and *Gradus* together. In other places he uſes the Word *Gradus* only. As in his Epiſtle to *Euſtochium* [*w*] he calls Presbyters Prieſts of the Inferior Degree; and in his Epiſtle to *Heliodore* [*x*], Deacons the Third Degree: And in his Comment upon *Micah* [*y*], Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, the Degrees in the Church. At other times he expreſſes his meaning by the Word Offices. As where [*z*] he ſays, That Biſhop, Presbyter and Deacon, are not Names of Men's Merits, but of their Offices. So that it is all one according to St. *Jerom*, whether we ſay the Order, or the Degree, or the Office, or the Power and Juriſdiction of a Biſhop: For all theſe are intended to expreſs the ſame thing, *viz.* The Authority of Biſhops over their Presbyters and the whole Church. And in this Senſe I uſe the Word *Order*, in this Diſcourſe, to expreſs the Opinion of the Ancients, concerning the different Powers of Biſhops and Presbyters in the Church.

[*t*] Id. Ep. ad Ruſtic. T. 1. p. 46. Singuli Eccleſiarum Epiſcopi, ſinguli Archipresbyteri, ſinguli Archidiaconi, & omnis Ordo Eccleſiaſticus ſuis Rectoribus nititur. [*u*] Id. ad Fabiol. de 42. Manſion. Iſrael. T. 3. p. 44. Ipſos ſecundi Ordinis intelligimus Præceptores, Luca Evangeliſta teſtante, Duodecim fuiſſe Apoſtolos, & ſeptuaginta Diſcipulos minoris Gradus.

[*w*] Ep. 27. ad Euſtoch. Aderant Hieroſolymarum & aliarum Urbium Epiſcopi, & Sacerdotum Inferioris Gradus, & Levitarum innumerabilis multitudo. [*x*] Ep. 1 ad Heliodor. Non minorem in Tertio Gradu adhibuit diligentiam, &c. [*y*] Com. in Mic. 7. p. 162. Non hoc dico, quod iſtiuſmodi Gradibus in Eccleſia non debeatis eſſe ſubjecti.

[*z*] Cont. Jovin. Lib. 1 p. 41. Epiſcopus, Presbyter, & Diaconus non ſunt Meritorum nomina, ſed Officiorum. Si Diaconus ſanctior Epiſcopo ſuo fuerit, non ex eo quod inferior Gradu eſt, apud Chriſtum deterior eſt.

Sect. 2.

The Order of Biſhops always owned to be Superior to that of Presbyters.

Now that there was ſuch a Diſtinction always obſerved in the Church, is evident, 1ſt, From the Teſtimony of the moſt Ancient Writers; who ſpeak of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as diſtinct Degrees in the Church, and the Two latter as Subordinate to the firſt. The Teſtimonies of *Ignatius* to this purpoſe [*a*] are ſo full and evident, that nothing was ever pretended to be ſaid againſt them, ſave only that they are not the Genuine Remains of that Ancient Author; which has been ſo often conſidered and replied to by Learned [*b*] Men, that there is no pretence left to favour ſuch an Imagination. The Citations are too numerous to be here inſerted at large, and therefore I ſhall only give the Reader a Specimen in one ſingle Teſtimony, by which he may judge of all the reſt. In his Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*, he exhorts them [*c*] to do all things in Unity, under the Biſhop preſiding in the place of God, and the Presbyters in the place of the Apoſtolical Senate, and the Deacons to whom is committed the Miniſtry and Service of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Author of the Acts of the Martyrdom of *Ignatius* [*d*], lately publiſhed from an Ancient *Greek* Copy, ſpeaks exactly in the ſame manner, of theſe Three Orders, when he ſays, That as *Ignatius* was on his Journey to *Rome*, all the Cities and Churches of *Aſia* ſent to ſalute him by their Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons. Not long after theſe Authors, lived *Pius* Biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe Authority I cite,

[*a*] Ignat. Ep. ad Epheſ. n. 2, 3, 4. Ep. ad Philad. n. 4, 7, 10. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8, & 12. Ep. ad Trall. n. 2, 7, 12, 13. Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 6. [*b*] Pearſon Vind. Ignat. Uſſer. de Epiſt. Ignat. Voſſ. Epiſt. ad Rivet. Coteler. Præf. & Not. in Ignat. Bull Defenſ. Fid. Nic. Sect. 3. n. 6. p. 290, &c. [*c*] Ignat. Ep. ad Magneſ. n. 6. [*d*] Martyr. Ignat. ap. Grabe Spicil. Sæcul. 2. T. 1. p. 11.

be-

becauſe *Blondel* [e] allows it to be Genuine. This Author in his Epiſtle to *Juſtus* of *Vienna*, gives him the Title of Biſhop [f], and ſpeaks of Presbyters and Deacons under him. In the beginning of the next Age we have the Teſtimonies of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* and *Tertullian*, all agreeing in the ſame thing, that there were then in their own Times the different Orders of Biſhops and Presbyters in this Church. There are here in the Church, ſays *Clemens*, [g], the different Degrees or Progreſſions of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, in imitation of the Angelical Glory. *Origen* takes notice of the Diſtinction above ten times [h] in his Works, which thoſe that pleaſe may read at large in Biſhop *Pearſon*. I ſhall only recite Two Paſſages, one out of his Homilies upon St. *Luke*, written whilſt he was a Layman, where he ſays, That [i] Digamy excludes Men from all Eccleſiaſtical Dignities: For one that is Twice Married, can neither be made Biſhop, Presbyter, nor Deacon. Here he calls them different Dignities; in the other [k] place he calls them different Degrees, ſaying, Every one ſhall be puniſhed according to his Degree: If the Supreme Governor of the Church offends, he ſhall have the greater Puniſhment. A Layman will deſerve Mercy in compariſon of a Deacon, and a Deacon in compariſon

[e] Blondel. Apol. p. 18. [f] Pius Ep. 2. ad Juſt. Vien. Tu vero apud Senatoriam Viennam——— Colobio Epiſcoporum veſtitus, &c. Presbyteri & Diaconi te obſervent.

[g] Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib 6. p. 667. ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὴν ἐκλησίαν θεωροῦσι ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, &c. Id. Pædag Lib. 3. c. 12. p. 264. [h] Origen. Hom. 2 in Num. Hom. 2. in Cantic. Hom. 6. in Eſai. Hom. 5, & 16. in Ezek. Com. in Mat. 19, & 21. De Orat. ap Pearſon. Vindic. Ignat. Part. 1. c. 11. p. 320. [i] Orig. Hom. 17. in Luc. Ab Eccleſiaſticis Dignitatibus non ſolum Fornicatio ſed & Nuptiæ repellunt. Neq; enim Epiſcopus, nec Presbyter, nec Diaconus, nec Vidua poſſunt eſſe Digami. [k] Orig Hom. 5. in Ezek. Pro modo Graduum unuſquiſq; torquebitur, &c.

of a Presbyter. So that Biſhops, in his Opinion, were then a Degree above Presbyters and Deacons. *Tertullian* frequently [*l*] mentions the ſame Diſtinction, but more eſpecially in his Book *de Baptiſmo*, where he ſays [*m*] The Right of Baptizing belongs to the Chief Prieſt, who is the Biſhop; and after him to Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the Authority of the Biſhop, for the Honour of the Church, in the Preſervation of which conſiſts the Churches Peace.

Theſe Allegations are ſufficient Evidences, as to Matter of Fact, and the Practice of the Church in the Three firſt Ages, that there was then an Order of Chief Prieſts, or Biſhops, ſuperior to Presbyters, ſettled and allowed in the Chriſtian Church.

Sect. 3. *The Order of Biſhops of Apoſtolical Inſtitution.*

If we proceed a little farther into this Enquiry, and examine from what Original this Appointment came, whether from Eccleſiaſtical or Apoſtolical Inſtitution; which is another Queſtion concerning Matter of Fact, that will in ſome meaſure determine the Right alſo: The ſame Authors, with the unanimous Conſent of all others, declare, That it was no Human Invention, but an Original Settlement of the Apoſtles themſelves, which they made by Divine Appointment. The Order of Biſhops, ſays *Tertullian*, [*n*] when it is traced up to its Original, will be found to have St. *John* for one of its Authors. This agrees

[*l*] Tertul. De Monogam. c. 11. De Fuga. c. 11. De Præſcript. c. 41. [*m*] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Dandi quidem jus habet ſummus Sacerdos, qui eſt Epiſcopus: Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen ſine Epiſcopi auctoritate, propter Eccleſiæ honorem; quo ſalvo ſalva Pax eſt. [*n*] Tertul. adv. Marcion Lib. 4. c. 5. Ordo Epiſcoporum ad originem recenſus, in Joannem ſtabit Auctorem.

exactly

exactly with what *Clemens Alexandrinus* [o] has recorded of him, That when he was ſettled at *Epheſus*, he went about the Neighbouring Regions, Ordaining Biſhops, and ſetting apart ſuch Men for the Clergy, as were ſignified to him by the Holy Ghoſt. Theſe were thoſe *Aſiatick* Biſhops that St. *Jerom* [p] ſpeaks of, who ſays that at their requeſt St. *John* wrote his Goſpel againſt the Hereſies of *Ebion* and *Cerinthus*. Whence it follows, that according to this Account, the Order of Biſhops was ſettled before the Canon of Scripture was concluded. Whence *Clemens* of *Alexandria* [q] farther obſerves, That there are many Precepts in Scripture appertaining to particular ſorts of Perſons, ſome to Presbyters, ſome to Deacons, and ſome to Biſhops alſo. *Irenæus* declares himſelf of the ſame Opinion, that there were Biſhops as well as Presbyters in the Apoſtles Days. For the Aſſembly of *Miletus*, he ſays, [r] was compoſed of Biſhops and Presbyters, that were of *Epheſus* and the Neighbouring Cities of *Aſia*. And therefore agreeably to that Hypotheſis, he always derives the Succeſſion of Biſhops and their Original from the Apoſtles. As where he ſays [s] that *Hyginus* Biſhop of *Rome* was the Ninth in order of Epiſcopal Succeſſion from the Apoſtles [t]. And in another Place [u] giving an exact Catalogue of the 12 Biſhops of *Rome* that go-

[o] Clem. Alex. Quis dives Salvetur. ap Combefiſ. Auctar. Noviſſim. p. 185. & ap. Euſeb. Lib. 3. c. 23. [p] Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. Eccleſ. in Joanne. Noviſſimus omnium ſcripſit Evangelium, rogatus ab Aſiæ Epiſcopis. [q] Clem. Alex. Pædag. Lib. 3. c. 12. p. 264. [r] Iren. Lib. 3. c. 14. In Mileto convocatis Epiſcopis & Presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheſo & à reliquis proximis Civitatibus. [s] Id. Lib. 1. c. 28. Hyginus nonum locum Epiſcopatus per ſucceſſionem ab Apoſtolis habuit. [t] Euſeb. Lib. 4. c. 11. *cites the ſame out of* Irenæus.

[u] Iren. Lib. 3. c. 3. Fundantes & inſtruentes beati Apoſtoli Eccleſiam, Lino Epiſcopatum adminiſtrandæ Eccleſiæ tradiderunt. *Cited alſo by* Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 6.

verned ſucceſſively in that See to his own time, he ſays of *Linus* the firſt of them, that he was ordained Biſhop immediately by the Apoſtles, upon the firſt Foundation of the Church; and of *Eleutherius* the laſt of them, that he was the Twelfth Biſhop from the Apoſtles. *Tertullian* [w] inſiſts much upon the ſame Argument, and makes a Challenge to all ſorts of Hereticks upon it: Let them ſhew us the Original of their Churches, and give us a Catalogue of their Biſhops in an exact Succeſſion from Firſt to Laſt, whereby it may appear, that their firſt Biſhop had either ſome Apoſtle, or ſome Apoſtolical Man, living in the time of the Apoſtles, for his Author or immediate Predeceſſor. For thus it is that Apoſtolical Churches make their Reckoning. The Church of *Smyrna* counts up to *Polycarp* ordained by St. *John*; The Church of *Rome* to *Clemens* ordained by St. *Peter*; And ſo all other Churches in like manner exhibit their firſt Biſhops ordained by the Apoſtles, by whom the Apoſtolical Seed was propagated and conveyed to others. This implies that the Apoſtles, as they founded Churches, ſettled Biſhops in them; and that this might be proved from the Records and Archives of every Church, the moſt of which were probably then remaining, when *Tertullian* made this

[w] Tertul. de Præſcript. c. 32. Edant Origines Eccleſiarum ſuarum: Evolvant ordinem Epiſcoporum ſuorum, ita per ſucceſſiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Epiſcopus aliquem ex Apoſtolis, vel Apoſtolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apoſtolis perſeveraverint, habuerit Auctorem & Anteceſſorem. Hoc enim modo Eccleſiæ Apoſtolicæ cenſus ſuos deferunt: Sicut Smyrnæorum Eccleſia Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert: Sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit: Proinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatum conſtitutos, Apoſtolici ſeminis Traduces habent. *See alſo* c. 36. ibid. Polycrat. Epiſt. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 24. Cyprian. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian, p. 104. Cum Fabiani Locus, id eſt, Locus Petri, & gradus Cathedræ ſacerdotalis vacaret. Id. Ep. 27. al. 33. ed. Oxon.

Chal-

Challenge to all Hereticks, and appealed to these Original Records in behalf of the Catholick Church.

Sect. 4. *A List or Catalogue of such Bishops as were first Ordained by the Apostles.*

An Exact and Authentick Catalogue of these first Foundations, would be a very useful and entertaining thing: But at this Distance of Time, it is impossible to gratifie the World with any such Curiosity, whatever Pains should be taken about it. Yet there are some scatter'd Remains and Fragments to be collected out of the Ancient Writers, which will sufficiently answer our present Design; which is, to evidence that the Apostles settled Bishops in all Churches upon their first Plantation.

To begin with the Church of *Rome*: We have already heard *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* declaring, that the Apostles Ordained a Bishop there. And the same is asserted by St. *Chrysostom* [x], and *Eusebius* [y], and *Ruffin* [z], and St. *Jerom* [a], and *Optatus* [b], and *Epiphanius* [c], and St. *Austin*; who says, [d] If the Order of Bishops succeeding one another be of any Consideration, we take the surest and soundest way, who begin to number from St. *Peter*: For *Linus* succeeded *Peter*; and *Clemens*, *Linus*; and *Anacletus*, *Clemens*, &c.

'Tis true, there is a little difference in the Account which these Authors give of the Succession; for some reckon *Linus* first, then *Anacletus*, then *Clemens*: Others begin with *Clemens*, and reckon him

[x] Chrys. Hom. 10. in 2 Tim. [y] Euseb. Lib. 3. c. 4. [z] Ruffin. ap. Hieron. Apol. 2. p. 219. [a] Hieron. Catal. Script. in Clemen. [b] Optat. Lib. 2. p. 48. [c] Epiph. Hær. 27. [d] Aug. Ep. 165. Si Ordo Episcoporum sibi succedentium considerandus est; quanto certius & vere salubriter ab ipso Petro numeramus? ---- Petro enim successit Linus, Lino Clemens, Clementi Anacletus, &c.

the

the firſt in Order from St. *Peter*. But this is eaſily reconciled by learned [*e*] Men; who make it appear, that *Linus* and *Anacletus* died whilſt St. *Peter* lived; and that *Clemens* was Ordained their Succeſſor by St. *Peter* alſo. So that we have Two or Three Perſons, by this Account, Ordained ſucceſſively Biſhops of *Rome* by the Hands of the Apoſtles.

Next, for the Church of *Jeruſalem*; it is unanimouſly deliver'd by all Ancient Writers, that *James* the Lord's Brother was the Firſt Biſhop thereof. St. *Jerom* [*f*] ſays, He was Ordained by the Apoſtles immediately after our Lord's Crucifixion. *Epiphanius* [*g*] calls him therefore the Firſt Biſhop; the Firſt who had an Epiſcopal Chair, the Firſt to whom Chriſt committed his own Throne upon Earth. *Chryſoſtom* [*h*] ſays, He was made Biſhop by Chriſt himſelf: The Author [*i*] of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions; Both by Chriſt, and the Apoſtles. In like manner, *Euſebius* [*k*] always ſpeaks of him under that Character, as Firſt Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, Ordained by the Apoſtles. So *Hegeſippus* [*l*], *Clemens* [*m*] *Alexandrinus*, and *Dionyſius* [*n*] Biſhop of *Corinth*, all cited by *Euſebius*. To whom we may add St. *Auſtin* [*o*], who ſtiles *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* St.

[*e*] Cotel. Not. in Conſt. Apoſt. Lib. 7. c. 46. Pearſon de Succeſſ. Rom. Pontif. Diſſert. 2. c. 2. Cave Hiſt. Lit. Vol. 1. in Clem.

[*f*] Hieron. Catal. Script. c. 3. Poſt Paſſionem Domini, ſtatim ab Apoſtolis Hieroſolymorum Epiſcopus ordinatus. Id. Com. in Gal. 1. p. 165. Hic Jacobus primus Hieroſolymorum Epiſcopus fuit. [*g*] Epiphan. Hær. 78. Antidicomar. n. 7. Id. Hær. 29. Nazor. n. 3. Hær. 66. Manich. n. 19.

[*h*] Chryſ. Hom. 38. in 1 Cor 15. [*i*] Conſt. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 35. [*k*] Euſeb. Lib. 2. c. 23. Lib. 3. c. 5, & 7. Lib. 7. c. 19.

[*l*] Hegeſip. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 2. c. 23. [*m*] Clem. Hypotypoſ. Lib. 6. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 2. c. 1. [*n*] Dionyſ. Ep. ad Athenienſ. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 4. c. 23. [*o*] Aug. contra Creſcon. Lib. 2. c. 37. Hieroſolymitanam Eccleſiam primus Apoſtolus Jacobus

St. *James*'s Succeſſor, and Poſſeſſor of the Chair wherein he ſat as firſt Biſhop of the Place. And it is remarkable, what *Clemens*, one of the ancienteſt of theſe Writers ſays, That this was deſigned as a peculiar Honour to St. *James*, in regard that he was the Brother of Chriſt: For tho' our Saviour uſually gave the Preference to *Peter* and *John*, and *James* his Brother; yet none of thoſe contended about this Honour, but choſe this *James*, ſirnamed *Juſtus*, to be Biſhop of the Place; where he lived a Saint, and died a Martyr.

Some time after his Death, as *Euſebius* [*p*] relates from Ancient Tradition, the Apoſtles and Diſciples of our Lord, as many as were yet in being, met together with our Saviour's Kinſmen (ſeveral of which were then alive) to conſult about chuſing a Succeſſor in St. *James*'s room; and they unanimouſly agreed upon *Simeon*, Son of *Cleopas*, our Saviour's Couſin according to the Fleſh; thinking him the moſt fit and worthy Perſon to ſit upon the Epiſcopal Throne. The ſame is aſſerted by *Euſebius* in other [*q*] Places, and the Author [*r*] of the Conſtitutions under the Name of *Clemens Romanus*.

From *Jeruſalem*, if we paſs to *Antioch*, there again we find *Euodius* firſt, and after him *Ignatius*, Ordained Biſhops by the Hands of the Apoſtles. *Baronius* [*s*] and ſome others fancy, that they ſat both at the ſame time; the one as Biſhop of the *Jews*, and the other of the *Gentiles*: But *Euſebius* [*t*] ſays expreſly, that *Euodius* was the firſt, and *Ig-*

bus Epiſcopatu ſuo rexit. Id. cont. Liter. Petil. Lib. 2. c. 51. Cathedra Eccleſiæ Hieroſolymitanæ, in qua Jacobus ſedit, & in qua hodie Joannes ſedet. *See alſo* Cyril. Catechiſm. 4. n. 17. Catech. 14. n. 13. [*p*] Euſeb. Lib. 3. c. 11. [*q*] Idem Chronic. [*r*] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 7. c. 46. [*s*] Baron. an. 45. n. 14. an. 71. n. 11. Halloix Vit. Ignat. c. 2. p. 394. [*t*] Euſeb. Lib 3. c. 22.

natius

natius the ſecond, after *Euodius* was dead. And it is agreed by all Ancient Writers, that they were both conſecrated before St. *Peter*'s Death. Of *Euodius* there can be no queſtion made, if it appears that *Ignatius* was ordained by the Apoſtles in his room. Now this is moſt expreſly ſaid by *Theodoret* [*u*], That he received the Gift of the High-Prieſthood, ἀρχιερωσύνης χάριν from the Hand of the Great *Peter*. In like manner, *Chryſoſtom* in his Encomium [*w*] upon him, ſays, He does not only admire him, becauſe he was thought worthy of ſo high a Degree; but that he was Ordained to it by thoſe Holy Men, and had the Hands of the Bleſſed Apoſtles laid upon his Sacred Head. The ſame is ſaid in effect by *Athanaſius* [*x*], when he calls him the firſt Biſhop of *Antioch* after the Apoſtles; and *Origen* [*y*], who calls him the ſecond after St. *Peter*; and *Jerom* [*z*], the third: For tho' they count differently, yet they mean the ſame thing; That *Ignatius* was Ordained Succeſſor to *Euodius* while the Apoſtles lived, and ſo might be called either ſecond or third after the Apoſtles, according as St. *Peter* and *Euodius* were included, or excluded out of the Number.

From *Antioch* let us go to *Smyrna*; where we ſhall find *Polycarp*, another Apoſtolical Biſhop, Ordained by the Apoſtles. St. *Jerom* aſcribes his Ordination [*a*] to St. *John*, whoſe Diſciple he was. *Irenæus* ſays, he himſelf knew him; and therefore could not miſtake in what he relates of him; which is, That

[*u*] Theod. Dial. 1. T. 5. p. 33. [*w*] Chryſoſt. Hom. 42. in Ignat. Tom. 1. p. 563. Ed. Front. Duc. [*x*] Athan. de Synod. Arim. T. 1. p. 922. [*y*] Orig. Hom. 6. in Luc. Ignatium dico Epiſcopum Antiochiæ poſt Petrum Secundum. [*z*] Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. in Ignat. Tertius poſt Petrum Apoſtolum Epiſcopus. [*a*] Hieron. Catal. Script. c. 17. Polycarpus Joannis Apoſtoli Diſcipulus, ab eo Smyrnæ Epiſcopus ordinatus.

he

he was Ordained Biſhop by the [*b*] Apoſtles. *Tertullian* [*c*] and *Euſebius* [*d*] witneſs the ſame; the one ſaying, that he was Ordained by St. *John*; and the other, by thoſe that had ſeen the Lord.

Papias was another Diſciple of St. *John*, [*e*] as both *Irenæus* and St. *Jerom* witneſs: And he was cotemporary with *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, and Biſhop of *Hierapolis* about the ſame time; that is, in the beginning of the Second Century. So that it is probable, he was another of thoſe Biſhops which St. *John* Ordained in *Aſia*, tho' we have no expreſs Teſtimony to prove it.

But it is aſſerted by all Ancient Writers, That *Timothy* was Ordained Biſhop of *Epheſus* by St. *Paul*. *Euſebius* [*f*], *Chryſoſtom* [*g*], *Epiphanius* [*h*], *Jerom* [*i*], *Hilary* the Deacon [*k*], and the Author of the Paſſion of *Timothy* in *Photius* [*l*], unanimouſly atteſt it. And *Theodoret* [*m*] affirms moreover, That he was Biſhop, under the Title of an Apoſtle.

Moſt of the ſame Authors agree in the ſame Evidence for *Titus*, [*n*] That he was made Biſhop of *Crete* by St. *Paul* alſo. And *Chryſoſtom* [*o*] with *Euſebius*, ſeems to give both him and *Timothy* the Power of Metropolitans; of which more hereafter.

[*b*] Iren. Lib. 3. c. 3. Ab Apoſtolis in Aſia, in ea quæ eſt Smyrnis Eccleſia, conſtitutus Epiſcopus, quem & nos vidimus in prima noſtra ætate. [*c*] Tertul. de Præſcrip. c. 32. [*d*] Euſeb. Lib. 3. c. 36. & Lib. 4. c. 14. [*e*] Iren. Lib. 5. c. 33. Papias Joannis Auditor, Polycarpi Contubernalis. Hieron. Ep. 29. ad Theodor. It. de Scriptor. [*f*] Euſeb. Lib. 3. c. 4. [*g*] Chryſ. Hom. 1. in Philip. [*h*] Epiph. Hær. 75. Aerian. [*i*] Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. in Timotheo. [*k*] Pſeudo-Ambroſ. Præf. in Tim. It. Com. in 1 Tim. 3. [*l*] Phot Cod. 254. [*m*] Theodor. Com. in 1 Tim. 3. 1. [*n*] Euſeb. & Chryſoſt. loc. cit. Hieron. de Scriptor. in Tito. Pſeudo-Ambroſ. Præf. in Tit. Theodor. loc. cit. [*o*] Chryſ. Hom. 1. in Tit. It. Hom. 15. in 1 Tim.

Others

Others ſay, that *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* was made firſt Biſhop of *Athens*. *Euſebius* [p] more than once mentions an Epiſtle of *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Corinth*, a very ancient Writer of the Second Century, wherein this is expreſly aſſerted. So that he muſt be Ordained, either by St. *Paul* himſelf, as *Suidas* and others [q] think, or by ſome other Apoſtle. 'Tis generally agreed, that this *Dionyſius* died ſome time before St. *John*, and was ſucceeded in his Biſhoprick by *Publius*, and he by *Quadratus*, whom St. *Jerom* [r] calls a Diſciple of the Apoſtles; which, in all probability, refers to his being tutor'd by St. *John*. Now if *Quadratus* himſelf was St. *John*'s Diſciple, (as he might be, who was Biſhop in the time of the Emperor *Hadrian*, to whom he preſented his Apology;) then there might be Three Biſhops ſucceſſively at *Athens*, all trained up by the Apoſtles, and Two of them conſecrated by their Hands, or at leaſt with their Conſent and Approbation.

I ſhall end this Catalogue of Primitive Biſhops, with what *Theodoret* [s] ſays of *Epaphroditus*; That as *Timothy* and *Titus* were Biſhops of *Epheſus* and *Crete* under the Name of Apoſtles, ſo *Epaphroditus* was Biſhop of *Philippi* under the ſame Title; which was then the common Name of all that were properly Biſhops: Of which I ſay no more in this Place, becauſe I give a more particular Account of it in the following Chapter.

---

[p] Euſeb. Lib 3. c. 4. It. Lib. 4. c. 23. [q] Suidas in Voce Dionyſ. Maxim. Prolog. ad Oper. Dionyſii. [r] Hieron. de Scriptor. c. 19. Quadratus Apoſtolorum Diſcipulus, Publio Athenarum Epiſcopo ob Chriſti fidem Martyrio coronato, in locum ejus ſubſtituitur. [s] Theod. Com. in 1 Tim. 3. 1.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the ſeveral Titles of Honour given to Biſhops in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 1. *All Biſhops at firſt called Apoſtles.*

FOR farther Confirmation of what has been aſſerted in the foregoing Chapter, it will not be amiſs here to ſubjoin next a ſhort Account of the ſeveral Titles of Honour which were given to Biſhops in the Primitive Church. The moſt Ancient of theſe, is the Title of Apoſtles; which, in a large and ſecondary Senſe, is thought by many to have been the Original Name for Biſhops, before the Name Biſhop was appropriated to their Order. For at firſt they ſuppoſe, the Names Biſhop and Presbyter, to have been common Names for all of the Firſt and Second Order; during which time, the appropriate Name for Biſhops, to diſtinguiſh them from mere Presbyters, was that of Apoſtles. Thus *Theodoret* [*t*] ſays expreſly, The ſame Perſons were anciently called promiſcuouſly both Biſhops and Presbyters, whilſt thoſe who are now called Biſhops, were called Apoſtles. But ſhortly after, the Name of Apoſtles was appropriated to ſuch only as were Apoſtles indeed; and then the Name Biſhop was given to thoſe who before were called Apoſtles. Thus, he ſays, *Epaphroditus* was the Apoſtle of the *Philippians*, and *Titus* the Apoſtle of the *Cretians*, and *Timothy* the Apoſtle of the *Aſiaticks*. And this he repeats [*u*] in ſeveral other Places of his Writings.

[*t*] Theodor. Com. in 1 Tim. 3. 1. [*u*] Theodor. Com. in Phil. 1. 1. It. in Phil. 2. 25.

The

The Author under the Name of St. *Ambroſe* [w] aſſerts the ſame thing; That all Biſhops were called Apoſtles at firſt. And therefore, he ſays, [x] that St. *Paul*, to diſtinguiſh himſelf from ſuch Apoſtles, calls himſelf an Apoſtle, not of Man, nor ſent by Man to Preach, as thoſe others were, who were choſen and ſent by the Apoſtles to confirm the Churches. *Amalarius* [y] cites another Paſſage out of this ſame Author, which ſpeaks more fully to the purpoſe: They, ſays he, who are now called Biſhops, were originally called Apoſtles: But the Holy Apoſtles being dead, they who were ordained after them to govern the Churches, could not arrive to the Excellency of thoſe Firſt; nor had they the Teſtimony of Miracles, but were in many other reſpects inferior to them: Therefore they thought it not decent to aſſume to themſelves the Name of Apoſtles; but dividing the Names, they left to Presbyters the Name of the Presbytery, and they themſelves were called Biſhops.

This is what thoſe Authors infer from the Identity of the Names, Biſhop and Presbyter, in the firſt Age: They do not thence argue (as ſome who abuſe their Authority have done ſince) that therefore Biſhops and Presbyters were all one; but they think that Biſhops were then diſtinguiſhed by a more appropriate Name, and more expreſſive of their Superiority, which was that of Secondary Apoſtles.

Sect. 2. *After that, Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.*

Afterward Biſhops thought it Honour enough for them to be ſtiled the Apoſtles Succeſſors. As *Cyprian* [z], and *Firmilian* [a], and

[w] Ambroſ. Com. in Eph. 4. Apoſtoli Epiſcopi ſunt.
[x] Id. Com. in Gal. 1. 1. [y] Amalar. de Offic. Eccleſ. Lib. 2. c. 13. Qui nunc Epiſcopi nominantur, illi tunc Apoſtoli dicebantur, *&c* [z] Cypr. Ep. 69. al. 66. ad Florent. Qui Apoſtolis vicaria Ordinatione ſuccedunt. Id. Ep. 42 al. 45. ad Cornel. Laborare debemus, ut unitatem à Domino, & per Apoſtolos nobis Succeſſoribus traditam, obtinere curemus.
[a] Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 225.

the

the Biſhops in the Council [*b*] of *Carthage* call themſelves and others. And St. *Jerom* [*c*] ſpeaks of them in the ſame Stile, ſaying, Whereſoever a Biſhop is, whether at *Rome*, or *Eugubium*; at *Conſtantinople*, or at *Rhegium*; at *Alexandria*, or at *Tanis*; they are all of equal Merit, their Prieſthood is the ſame; they are all Succeſſors to the Apoſtles. And both he and St. *Auſtin* [*d*] draw that of the Pſalmiſt to this Senſe; *Inſtead of thy Fathers thou ſhalt have Children, whom thou may'ſt make Princes in all Lands:* They ſay, Biſhops are the Sons of the Apoſtles, and Princes and Fathers in the Church.

Sect. 3. *Whence every Biſhop's See called* Sedes Apoſtolica.

And hence it was that anciently every Biſhop's See was dignify'd with the Title of *Sedes Apoſtolica*, an Apoſtolical See; which in thoſe Days was no peculiar Title of the Biſhop of *Rome*, but given to all Biſhops in general, as deriving their Original, and counting their Succeſſion from the Apoſtles. The Catholick Church, ſays St. *Auſtin*, [*e*] is propagated and diffuſed over all the World by the Apoſtolical Sees, and the Succeſſion of Biſhops in them. 'Tis plain, this is not ſpoken only of the Biſhop of *Rome*, but of all other Biſhops whatſoever. *Sidonius Apollinaris* [*f*] uſes the ſame Expreſſion, in ſpeaking of a private *French* Biſhop, who ſat Five and forty Years, he ſays, in

[*b*] Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. in Suffragio Clari à Maſcula.

[*c*] Hieron. Epiſt. 85. ad Evagr. It. in Pſal. 44. 16.

[*d*] Aug. Com. in Pſal. 44. 16. p. 169. Pro Apoſtolis nati ſunt Filii tibi, conſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi,---- Ipſa Eccleſia Patres illos appellat. [*e*] Aug. Ep. 42. ad Fratres Madaurenſ. Chriſtiana Societas per ſedes Apoſtolorum & ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum certa per orbem propagatione diffunditur. [*f*] Sidon. Lib. 6. Ep. 1. ad Lup. Tricaſſin. In Apoſtolica ſede novem jam decurſa Quinquennia.

his Apoſtolical See. And *Paulinus* [*g*] makes no more but the uſual Complement to *Alypius*, when he tells him, That God had deſervedly placed him in an Apoſtolical See with the Princes of his People.

Sect. 4. *Biſhops called Princes of the People.*

Where we muſt alſo note, That *Paulinus* ſpeaks in the uſual Phraſe and Stile of thoſe Ancient Times, when he calls Biſhops Princes of the People. For that was another uſual Title that was given them; as appears from *Optatus* [*h*], and ſeveral Paſſages in St. *Jerom* [*i*]; who, to diſtinguiſh them from Secular Princes, uſually ſtiles them *Principes Eccleſiæ*, [*k*] Princes of the Church, applying to them that Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, 60. 17. which, according to his Tranſlation, is, *I will make thy Princes Peace, and thy Biſhops Righteouſneſs:* Upon which he [*l*] has this Note; That the Majeſty of the Holy Scripture is to be admired, in that it calls thoſe who were to be Biſhops in future Ages, by the Name of Princes. In the *Greek* Writers they are ſtiled ἄρχοντες ἐκκλησιῶν, Governors and Princes likewiſe; as frequently in [*m*] *Euſebius*, *Origen* [*n*], *Chryſoſtom* [*o*], and many others.

Sect. 5. Præpoſiti, &c.

In the ſame Senſe, *Cyprian* [*p*], and *Tertullian* [*q*] commonly call

[*g*] Paulin. Ep. 45. ad Alypium. Cum Principibus populi ſui ſede Apoſtolica meritò collocavit Dominus. *See alſo* Tertul. de Præſcript. c. 36. Ipſæ adhuc Cathedræ Apoſtolorum ſuis Locis præſidentur — Habes Corinthum —— Habes Philippos, *&c.* [*h*] Optat. Lib. 1. p. 39. Ipſi Apices & Principes omnium Epiſcopi. [*i*] Hieron. Com. in Eſa. 3. [*k*] Hieron. Com. in Pſal. 44. Principes Eccleſiæ, id eſt, Epiſcopi. Id. Com in Eſa. 5. & Tit. 1. [*l*] Hieron. Com. in Eſa. 60. Scripturæ S. admiranda Majeſtas, quod Principes futuros Eccleſiæ Epiſcopos nominavit. [*m*] Euſeb. Hiſt. Lib. 6. c. 28. Lib 8. c. 1. & 3. It. de Martyr. Palæſt. c. 1. [*n*] Origen. Hom. 11. in Jerem. Cont. Celſ. Lib. 3. p. 129. [*o*] Chryſ. de Sacerdot. Lib. 3. c. 15. Id. Hom. 3. ad Pop. Antioch. T. 1. p. 48. [*p*] Cypr. Ep. 3, 9, 13. 27, 81. Ed. Oxon. Præpoſiti. [*q*] Tertul. Apol. c. 39. Ad Uxor. Lib. 1. c. 7. De Cor. Mil. c. 3. them

them Presidents, or Provosts of the Church; which *Eusebius* [r] and *Justin* [s] *Martyr* call προεστῶτες, and sometimes πρόεδροι [t], and others ἔφοροι [u] Inspectors; all which are proper Characters of Bishops; who have the Care, Presidency, and Inspection of the Church. προεστῶτες, πρόεδροι, ἔφοροι.

Sect. 6. Principes Sacerdotum, Pontifices Maximi, Summi Sacerdotes, &c.

And because this Presidency was not only over the People, but also over the Clergy; they were dignify'd upon that Account with the distinguishing Characters of *Summi Sacerdotes*, *Pontifices Maximi*, and *Principes Sacerdotum*, Chief Priests, and Princes of the Clergy. The Author under the Name of St. *Ambrose* [w] gives the Bishop expressly the Title of Chief Priest, and Prince of the Priests. And so frequently, the Name *Summus Sacerdos* is used by St. *Jerom*: As, where speaking of himself, he says, In the Opinion of all Men he was thought worthy of the High-Priesthood; he explains [x] himself to mean a Bishoprick. And in another place [y]; The Prosperity of the Church depends upon the Honour of the Chief Priest. The same Title is given to all Bishops, by the Author [z] of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament under the Name of St. *Austin*. *Sidonius* [a] calls them *Summi*

[r] Euseb. Lib. 6. c. 3, 8, 10. Lib. 7. c. 13. Lib. 8. c. 6.
[s] Just. Apol. 2. Chrysost. Hom. 3. in Colos. [t] Euseb. Lib. 8. c. 2. It. de Martyr. Palæst. c. 2. [u] Philostorg. Hist. Lib. 3. c 6. [w] Ambros. Com. in Eph. 4. In Episcopo omnes Ordines sunt, quia Primus Sacerdos est, hoc est, Princeps Sacerdotum. [x] Hieron. Ep. 99. ad Asellam. Omnium pene judicio dignus summo Sacerdotio decernebar.
[y] Id. Dial. c. Lucifer. p. 139. Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet. [z] Aug. Quæst. Vet. & N. Test. c. 101. Quid est Episcopus nisi primus Presbyter, id est, summus Sacerdos? [a] Sidon. Lib. 4. Ep. 11. Lib. 7. Ep. 5.

Pontifices; where he ſpeaks only of the Biſhops of *France*. And therefore, when *Tertullian* [*b*] gives the Title of *Pontifex Maximus* to the Biſhop of *Rome*, he does him no greater Honour, than in thoſe Days was done to every Biſhop in the World: And ſome think he meant not the Biſhop of *Rome* in particular, but comprehended all others under that Title. As it is certain the Council of *Agde* does, when it orders [*c*] every Metropolitan to call his Suffragans, *ad Ordinationem ſummi Pontificis*; which means not, to the Ordination of the Pope of *Rome*, but to the Ordination of any *French* Biſhop within the Metropolitan's Province or Juriſdiction. For then, as we have ſeen, *Summus Pontifex* was the ordinary Title of every Biſhop whatſoever.

Sect. 7. *Every Biſhop anciently called* Papa, *Father, or Pope.*

And ſo was the Name *Papa*, tho' now it is become the pretended Prerogative and ſole Privilege of the Biſhop of *Rome*. Some Hiſtorians [*d*] indeed are ſo vain as to aſſert confidently, That *Cyril* of *Alexandria* was the firſt Biſhop in thoſe Parts, who had the Honour of being called *Papa*, and that becauſe he was Pope *Celeſtine*'s Legate in the Council of *Epheſus*. The *Arabick* Writers, *Homaidius*, and *Abubacrus Habaſides*, cited by *Echellenſis* and Biſhop *Pearſon* [*e*], deliver a quite contrary Story; That the Name was firſt given to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and thence carried to *Rome*: Which ſeems to be ſaid, in anſwer to the *Romiſh* Pretences. But the Truth of the Matter is, That it was no peculiar Privilege of one Patriarch or other, but the common Title of all Biſhops,

[*b*] Tertul. de Pudicit. c. 1. [*c*] Con. Agathenſ. c. 35.
[*d*] Nicephorus *is cited and chaſtiſed by* Savaro *for this.* Vid. Savaro Not. in Sidon. Lib. 6. Ep. 1. [*e*] Pearſon Vind. Ignat. Part 1. c. 11. p. 330.

who

who were called Fathers [*f*] of the Church, and Fathers [*g*] of the Clergy; and *Papa* means no more. Therefore *Tertullian*, in his Book *de Pudicitia*, c. 13. ſpeaking indefinitely of any Chriſtian Biſhop, who abſolves Penitents, gives him the Name of *Benedictus Papa*. Or if we ſuppoſe, as ſome do, that he ſpeaks particularly of the Biſhop of *Rome*; yet there is nothing ſingular in it: For at the ſame time, *Dionyſius*, Presbyter of *Alexandria*, ſpeaking of *Heraclas* his Biſhop, gives him the very ſame Title [*h*], The Bleſſed Pope *Heraclas*. And *Arius* himſelf [*i*], in one of his Epiſtles, ſpeaks of his Biſhop *Alexander* in the ſame Stile. St. *Jerom* gives the Title [*k*] to *Athanaſius*, *Epiphanius*, and *Paulinus*: And writing often to St. *Auſtin*, he always inſcribes [*l*] his Epiſtles, *Beatiſſimo Papæ Auguſtino*. So among *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles, thoſe that are written to him are uſually inſcribed [*m*] in the ſame manner, *Cypriano Papæ*. And the Clergy of *Rome* themſelves [*n*] give him the Title of *Benedictus Papa*, and *Beatiſſimus* and *Glorioſiſſimus Papa Cyprianus*. It were eaſy to add many other Teſtimonies out of *Epiphanius*, and *Conſtantine*'s Epiſtles, and the *Theodoſian* Code, and eſpecially *Sidonius Apollinaris* [*o*], who always gives

[*f*] Aug. Com. in Pſal. 44. p. 169. Ipſa Eccleſia Patres illos appellat. Chryſoſt. Hom. 3. ad Popul. Antioch. T. 1. p. 43.

[*g*] Hieron. Ep. 62. ad Theoph. Epiſcopi contenti ſint Honore ſuo: Patres ſe ſciant eſſe, non Dominos. Id. Ep. 2. & 3. ad Nepotian. Com. in Pſal. 44, &c. [*h*] Dionyſ. Ep. ad Philemon. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 7. Παρὰ τῷ μακαρίῳ Πάπα ἡμῶν Ἡρακλᾷ. [*i*] Arius Ep. ad Euſeb. Nicom. ap. Theod. Lib. 1. c. 5. & ap. Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. [*k*] Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. p. 163. [*l*] Id. Ep. 17, 18, 25, 30. inter Epiſt. Auguſtini. [*m*] Cypr. Ep. 23, 31, 36. Edit. Oxon.

[*n*] Ep. 8. Cleri Rom. ad Cler. Carthag. ibid. Didicimus ſeceſſiſſe Benedictum Papam Cyprianum. Ep. 30. Cler. Rom. ad Cypr. Beatiſſime ac Glorioſiſſime Papa. [*o*] Sidon. Lib. 6. Epiſt. 1. Domino Papæ Lupo. Lib. 6. Ep. 2. Papæ Pragmatio. Lib. 6. Ep. 3. Domino Papæ Leontio. *And ſo for* 12 *Epiſtles together.*

the *French* Biſhops the Stile of *Dominus Papa*. But in ſo plain a Caſe I need not inſiſt any longer, eſpecially ſince a Learned *Romaniſt* [p] has undertaken to prove, out of Authors as late as *Photius* and *Gregory* of *Tours*, That *Papa* was the common Name of all Biſhops for ſeveral Ages: Who alſo notes out of *Balſamon*, That this Name was ſometimes given to the Inferior Clergy; who were called *Papæ Piſinni*, Little Fathers; and their Tonſure or Crown thence called παπαλήτζα, The Tonſure of the Fathers. In compariſon of whom, *Balſamon* [q] calls Presbyters and the *Chorepiſcopi*, *Protopapæ* and *Protopapades*, Chief Fathers; ſpeaking in the Language of his own Times, when the *Chorepiſcopi* and Presbyters were become all one.

Sect. 8. Pater Patrum, *and* Epiſcopus Epiſcoporum.

But Biſhops had ſtill a more Honourable Title than that of *Papa*: For they were commonly called *Patres Patrum*, and *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum*, Fathers of Fathers, and Biſhops of Biſhops. The firſt that had this Title, was *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; which made the Counterfeit Author under the Name of *Clemens Romanus* [r] inſcribe an Epiſtle (as directed to him) with this Title; *Clemens Jacobo Domino, Epiſcopo Epiſcoporum*, &c. To which *Sidonius Apollinaris* [s] alludes plainly, when writing to *Lupus* an eminent *French* Biſhop, he tells him, He was Father of Fathers, and Biſhop of Biſhops, and another *James* of his Age. By this we underſtand what *Tertullian* [t]

[p] Savaro Comment. in Sidon. Lib. 6. Ep. 1. p. 379.

[q] Balſam. Com. in Can. Apoſt. c. 59. It. in Con. Antioch. Can. 10. [r] Pſeudo-Clem. Ep. 1. ad Jacob. [s] Sidon. Lib. 6. Ep. 1. Tu Pater Patrum, & Epiſcopus Epiſcoporum, & alter Sæculi tui Jacobus. [t] Tertul. de Pudicit. c. 1. Audio etiam Edictum eſſe propoſitum, & quidem peremptorium, Pontifex ſcilicet Maximus, Epiſcopus Epiſcoporum dicit, Ego & Mœchiæ & Fornicationis delicta Pœnitentia defunctis dimitto.

means,

means, when ſpeaking ironically of the Catholick Biſhops, who admitted Adulterers into Communion again upon their Repentance, he ſays, I hear there is a Decree publiſhed, and that a peremptory one; The Chief Pontif, the Biſhop of Biſhops ſaith, I forgive the Sins of Adultery and Fornication, to all thoſe that repent of them. Some [u] take this for a peculiar Character of the Biſhop of *Rome*; and I will not deny, but that *Tertullian* might intend more eſpecially to reflect upon him: But yet there is nothing ſingular in the Title, which did not belong to other Biſhops as well as him; as appears from what has been already cited out of *Sidonius*. To which we may add the Teſtimony of *Athanaſius* [w], who ſtiles *Hoſius*, The Father of Biſhops. And *Gregory Nazianzen* [x] gives the ſame Title to his own Father, as St. *Jerom* [y] does to *Epiphanius*, ſtiling him the Father of all Biſhops. *Cotelerius* [z] obſerves, that *Gregory Nyſſen* is called πατὴρ πατέρων, Father of Fathers, by the Second Council of *Nice*; and others [a] ſay, *Theodoſius* the Emperor gave *Chryſoſtom* the ſame Honourable Title after Death. As to the Reaſon of theſe Names, it is probable ſome Biſhops might have them upon the Account of Perſonal Merit; and others from the Eminency of their Sees; as the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, to whom *Balſamon* [b] gives the Title of *Pater Patrum*, many Ages after: But there was a more general Reaſon why all Biſhops ſhould be called ſo, as may be collected from [c]

[u] Baron. an. 142. n. 4. an. 216. n. 4. Georg. Ambianas Obſerv. in Tertul. T. 3. p. 633. [w] Athan. Epiſt. ad ſolit. Vit. agentes. T. 1. p. 837. [x] Naz. Orat. 19 de Fun. Patr. p. 314. [y] Hieron. Ep. 61. p. 167. [z] Cotelier. Not. in Ep. Clem. p. 605. [a] Nicephor. Lib. 14. c. 43. [b] Balſam. Reſp. ad Interrogat. Marci ap. Leunclav. Jus Gr. Rom. T. 1. Lib. 5. p. 362. Κυρι& Μάρκ& πατέρων πατὴρ ὑπάρχων, &c. [c] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Aerian. Πατέρων γυνητικὴ τάξις. Πατέρας γὰ γυναῖ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

Epiphanius; who ſays, That the Order of Biſhops, was an Order that begat Fathers to the Church; that is, Biſhops made Biſhops by Ordination; whereas Presbyters could only beget Sons, by the Power which they had of Baptizing. And therefore, tho' we ſometimes find Presbyters called Fathers, yet we no where find the Title of *Pater Patrum* given to any of their Order. Yet I muſt here alſo obſerve, that ſeveral of theſe Titles were never kindly received among the *African* Fathers, becauſe the Biſhops of *Rome* began to abuſe them, to eſtabliſh an uſurped Authority over their Neighbours. Therefore, in Two *African* Councils held at *Carthage*, the one under [*d*] *Cyprian*, the other [*e*] in St. *Auſtin*'s time, theſe Titles, *Epiſcopus Epiſcoporum*, *Princeps Sacerdotum*, and *Summus Sacerdos*, were diſcountenanc'd and forbid, inſomuch that the Primates themſelves were not allowed to uſe them. But of this more hereafter, when we come to ſpeak of Metropolitans.

Sect. 9. *Biſhops ſometimes called Patriarchs.*

Gregory Nazianzen in his Rhetorical way uſually gives Biſhops the Title of Patriarchs; by which he means not Patriarchs in the proper Senſe, as the Word came afterward to be uſed in the Church, to ſignify Biſhops of the larger Sees, who had Primates and Metropolitans under them: But any Biſhops whatſoever, that were Heads of their own Family; that is, the Church ſubject to them. Thus he ſtiles his own Father Patriarch, [*f*]

[*d*] Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. p. 229. Neq; enim quiſquam noſtrum Epiſcopum ſe Epiſcoporum conſtituit, aut Tyrannico terrore ad obſequendi neceſſitatem Collegas ſuos adigit.

[*e*] Con. Carth. 3. c. 26. Ut Primæ ſedis Epiſcopus non appelletur Princeps Sacerdotum, aut Summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid hujuſmodi, ſed tantum Primæ ſedis Epiſcopus. [*f*] Naz. Orat. 19 p. 312. Or. 20. de Laud. Baſil. p. 342. Orat. 41. p. 675.

though

though he was but Biſhop of *Nazianzum*, a very ſmall City in *Cappadocia*, under *Cæſarea* the Metropolis. And in his Oration [*g*] before the Council of *Conſtantinople* he gives the ſame Title to all other Biſhops, complaining of the *Arian* Cruelties againſt them: Have we not had, ſays he, our Ancient Biſhops, or to ſpeak more properly, our Patriarchs publickly murder'd by them? In another place complaining of the corrupt Promotions and Practices of ſome Biſhops of his Age, he thus takes his leave of them [*h*], *Valete*; *Inſolentes eſtote*: *Patriarchatus per ſortes inter vos diſtribuite.* Farewel; Go on in your Inſolence: Divide the Patriarchal Dignities among you: Tranſlate your ſelves from See to See: Set up ſome, pull down others. Where it is evident he ſpeaks not of Patriarchs properly ſo called, but only of ſome Ambitious Spirits among the Biſhops, who turned all things into Confuſion, and did what they pleaſed with the Preferments of the Church. *Gregory Nyſſen* uſes the ſame Term for Biſhops, in his Funeral Oration upon *Meletius*, which he made in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, where he gives all the Biſhops then in Council the Title of Patriarchs: Behold [*i*] theſe Patriarchs: All theſe are the Sons of our *Jacob*; meaning *Meletius*, whom he calls *Jacob* for his Age, and the reſt Patriarchs, in alluſion to the Twelve Patriarchs who were *Jacob*'s Children. Thus Biſhops were commonly ſtiled, till ſuch times as the Name Patriarch became the appropriate Title of the moſt eminent Biſhops, ſuch as *Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, &c. And even ſome Ages after that, *de Marca* [*k*] obſerves, that *Athalaricus* and the reſt of the *Gothiſh* Kings in *Italy* gave the Name of Patriarchs to all Biſhops within their Dominions.

[*g*] Orat. 32. p. 525. [*h*] Naz. Cygn. Carm. de Epiſcopis T. 2. p. 308. [*i*] Greg. Nyſſ. Orat. de Fun. Melet. T. 3. p. 589. [*k*] Marca Diſſert. de Primatib. n. 20. p. 112.

It

Sect. 10. *And Vicars of Christ.*

It must not here be forgotten, that all Bishops anciently were stiled also Vicars of Christ, and had as much Interest in that Name as he that has since laid so much Claim to the Title. The Author of the Questions [*l*] under the Name of St. *Austin*, says expressly, That every Bishop is the Vicar of God. *Cyprian* says the same in several of his Epistles [*m*], that every Bishop is *Vice Christi*, Christ's Vicar or Vicegerent. And this is his meaning in that noted Passage to *Cornelius*, where [*n*] he says, All Heresies and Schisms take their Original from hence, that Men do not submit to God's Priest, and consider that there ought to be but one Bishop in a Church at a time, and one Judge as the Vicar of Christ. This is spoken of every Individual Bishop throughout the World, as *Rigaltius* [*o*] freely owns; and they grosly mistake *Cyprian*'s Meaning, and abuse his Authority, who apply it only to the Bishop of *Rome*. St. *Basil* [*p*] extends the Title to all Bishops; and so does the Author under the Name of St. *Ambrose* [*q*] who is supposed to be *Hilary*, a Deacon of the Church of *Rome*; which would have been an unpardonable Oversight in him, had it not been then the Custom of the World to give all others this Title as well as the Bishop of *Rome*.

[*l*] Aug. Quæst. Vet. & Nov. Test. c. 127. Antistitem Dei puriorem cæteris esse oportet.——Est enim vicarius ejus

[*m*] Cypr. Ep. 63 ad Cæcil. Ille Sacerdos Vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur. [*n*] Ep. 55. al. 59 ad Cornel p. 129. Neq; enim aliunde Hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex Vice Christi cogitatur. [*o*] Rigalt. in Loc. Ecce autem Episcopos ævo jam Cypriani vicarios Christi.

[*p*] Basil. Constit. Monach. c. 22. T 2. p. 792.

[*q*] Ambr. Com. in 1 Cor. 11. 10. Episcopus Personam habet Christi,——Vicarius Domini est, *&c.* *The Author of the Constitutions*, Lib. 2. c. 26. *stiles the Bishop* Θεὸν ὁπήκοον.

I shall

Sect. 11. *And Angels of the Churches.*

I ſhall but take notice of one Title more given to Biſhops, which is that of Angels of the Churches; a Name which ſome Authors [r] ſuppoſe to be uſed by St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 10. where he ſays, Women ought to be covered in the Church becauſe of the Angels; that is, Biſhops, ſays *Hilary* the Deacon, in the Place laſt mentioned. And ſo the ſame Author underſtands that of St. *John*, *Rev.* 1. 20. *The ſeven Stars are the Angels* [s] *of the ſeven Churches.* Which is alſo the Interpretation of St. *Auſtin* [t] and *Epiphanius* [u], who ſay that by Angels we are not there to underſtand the Celeſtial Angels (as *Origen* thought, who aſſigns a Guardian Angel [w] to every Church) but the Biſhops or Governors of thoſe Seven Churches. Hence in After-Ages Biſhops were called Angels of the Churches: As *Socrates* [x] terms *Serapion*, who was Biſhop of *Thmuis*, The Angel of the Church of *Thmuis:* And the Author of the ſhort Notes [y] upon *Timothy*, under the Name of St. *Jerom*, ſays of every Biſhop, That he is the Angel of God Almighty. In this Senſe Dr. *Hammond* [z] obſerves out of a *Saxon MS.* that in our own Language anciently Biſhops were called God's *Bydels*, that is, Meſſengers or Officers, as he explains it from Sir *Henry Spelman*'s Gloſſary, in the Word *Bedellus.* And thus much of thoſe ancient Titles of Honour, which were given to all Biſhops indifferently in the Primitive Church.

---

[r] Ambroſiaſter, ibid. Angelos Epiſcopos dicit, ſicut docetur in Apocalypſi Joannis. [s] Pſeudo-Ambroſ. in 1 Cor. 11. 10. [t] Aug. Ep 162. Divina voce laudatur ſub Angeli nomine Præpoſitus Eccleſiæ. [u] Epiph. Hær. 25. Nicolait. [w] Orig. Hom. 20. in Num. T. 1. p. 251. *So alſo* Andreas Cæſariens. Ἄγγελοι φύλακες. Com. in Apoc. 1. 20. [x] Socrat. Lib. 4. c. 23. [y] Hieron. Com. in 1 Tim 3. [z] Ham. Annot. *on* Rev. 1. 20.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the Offices of Biſhops as diſtinct from Presbyters.

Sect. 1. *A threefold difference between Biſhops and Presbyters in the Diſcharge of their Office and Function.*

I Come now to conſider the Epiſcopal Office and Function it ſelf: Where, to do Juſtice to Antiquity, it is neceſſary for me to obſerve a Threefold Diſtinction between Biſhops and Presbyters in the diſcharge of Eccleſiaſtical Offices. For 1ſt. in the common Offices, which were ordinarily intruſted in the Hands of Presbyters, ſuch as Preaching, Baptizing, Adminiſtring the Euchariſt, *&c.* there was this obvious difference betwixt a Biſhop and a Presbyter; that the one acted by an Abſolute and Independent Power, the other in Dependance upon, and Subordination to his Biſhop; by whoſe Authority and Directions under God he was to be Governed, and do nothing without his Conſent or againſt it: So that though there was no difference in the things that were done, yet there was an Eſſential Difference in the Power of doing them. This is an Obſervation not commonly made, but it is of very great uſe, both for eſtabliſhing the juſt bounds of Epiſcopal and Presbyterial Power, and clearing the Practice of the Primitive Church. 2*dly*, Some Offices were never intruſted in the hands of Presbyters; nor allowed, if performed by them; ſuch as the Ordination of Biſhops, Presbyters, *&c.* 3*dly*, Biſhops always retained the Power of calling their Presbyters to an Account, and cenſuring them for their Miſdemeanors in the Diſcharge of their Office; which Presbyters could not do by their Biſhop, being

ing always ſubject and ſubordinate to him as their Superior. Theſe things cleared and ſet in a fair Light, will give us a juſt Account of the Offices of a Biſhop, as diſtinct from that of a Presbyter, in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 2.

1. In the common Offices which might be performed by Both, the Biſhop acted by an Independent Power, but Presbyters in Dependance upon and Subordination to him.

Firſt then we are to obſerve, that in ſuch ordinary and common Offices as might be performed by both, Biſhops and Presbyters acted by a different Power; the Biſhop was the Abſolute, Independent Miniſter of the Church, and did whatever he did by his own Authority ſolely inherent in himſelf; but the Presbyters were only his Aſſiſtants, authorized to perform ſuch Offices as he intruſted them with, or gave them Commiſſion and Directions to perform, which they ſtill did by his Authority, and in Dependance upon, and Subordination to him as their Superior; and might do nothing againſt his Will, or Independent of him. This is clear from many Paſſages in *Ignatius*, *Cyprian*, and the Canons of the Ancient Councils, which all agree in this, That nothing is to be done without the Biſhop; that is, without his Knowledge, without his Conſent, Directions or Approbation. Thus [*a*] *Ignatius* in his Epiſtle to the Church of *Smyrna*: Let no one perform any Eccleſiaſtical Office without the Biſhop. Which he explains both there and elſewhere [*b*] to mean, without his Authority and Permiſſion. So in the Council [*c*] of *Laodicea*, it is expreſſed the ſame way: The Presbyters ſhall do nothing without the

[*a*] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8 Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. [*b*] Id. Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 4. Μηδὲν ἄνευ γνώμης σου γινέσθω. [*c*] Con. Laodic. Can. 56. Ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

Con-

Conſent of the Biſhop. The Councils [*d*] of *Arles* and *Toledo* [*e*] ſay, without his Privity or Knowledge. And the Apoſtolical Canons [*f*] give a Reaſon for all this, Becauſe the Biſhop is the Man to whom the Lord's People are committed, and he muſt give an Account of their Souls.

Sect. 3. *This ſpecified in the Office of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper.*

This Rule they particularly apply to the Offices of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper. A Presbyter might ordinarily adminiſter both theſe Sacraments; but not againſt the Will of his Biſhop, or in Oppoſition and Contradiction to him, but by his Conſent and Authority, in a due Subordination to him as his Superior. It is not lawful, ſays [*g*] *Ignatius*, either to baptize or celebrate the Euchariſt without the Biſhop: But that which he allows, is well-pleaſing to God. He does not ſay, that none but a Biſhop might adminſter theſe Sacraments, but that none was to do it without his Allowance and Approbation. And that is plainly the meaning of [*h*] *Tertullian* and St. *Jerom* [*i*] when they ſay, that Presbyters and Deacons have no Power to baptize, without the Command and Authority of the Biſhop or Chief Prieſt; and that this is for the Honour of the Church, and the Preſervation of Peace and Unity. St. *Ambroſe* [*ii*] aſ-

[*d*] Con Arelat. 1 can. 19. Ut Presbyteri ſine Conſcientia Epiſcoporum nihil faciant. [*e*] Con. Tolet. 1. can. 20. Sine Conſcientia Epiſcopi nihil penitus Presbyteri agere præſumant.

[*f*] Can. Apoſt. c. 39 [*g*] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8.

[*h*] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Dandi jus quidem habet ſummus Sacerdos, qui eſt Epiſcopus: Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi; non tamen ſine Epiſcopi Auctoritate, propter Eccleſiæ honorem, quo ſalvo ſalva Pax eſt. [*i*] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucifer. p. 139. Inde venit, ut ſine Juſſione Epiſcopi, neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habeant baptiſandi. [*ii*] Ambroſ. de ſacram. Lib. 3. c. 1. Licet Presbyteri fecerint, tamen Exordium Miniſterii à ſummo eſt Sacerdote.

ſerts

ſerts the ſame, that though Presbyters do baptize, yet they derive their Authority from their Superior.

Sect. 4. *And in the Office of Preaching.*

The like Obſervation may be made upon the Office of Preaching. This [*k*] was in the firſt Place the Biſhops Office, which they commonly diſcharged themſelves, eſpecially in the *African* Churches. Which is the Reaſon we ſo often meet with the Phraſe, *Tractante Epiſcopo*, the Biſhops Preaching, in the Writings [*l*] of St. *Cyprian*: For then it was ſo much the Office and Cuſtom of Biſhops to preach, that no Presbyter was permitted to preach in their Preſence, till the Time of St. *Auſtin*, who whilſt he was a Presbyter was authorized by *Valerius* his Biſhop to preach before him: But that, as *Poſſidius* [*m*] the Writer of his Life obſerves, was ſo contrary to the Uſe and Cuſtom of the *African* Churches, that many Biſhops were highly offended at it, and ſpake againſt it; till the Conſequence proved that ſuch a Permiſſion was of good Uſe and Service to the Church; and then ſeveral other Biſhops granted their Presbyters Power and Privilege to preach before them. So that it was then a Favour for Presbyters to preach in the Preſence of their Biſhops, and wholly at the Biſhops Diſcretion whether they would permit them or not; and when they did preach, it was *Poteſtate accepta*, by the Power and Authority of the Biſhops that appointed them. In the Eaſtern Churches Presbyters were more commonly employed to preach, as *Poſſi-*

[*k*] Vid. Can. Apoſt. c. 58. [*l*] Cyp. Ep. 52, 56, 83. Ed. Oxon. It. Pontius vit. Cypr. ibid. [*m*] Poſſid. Vit. Aug. c. 5. Eidem Presbytero Poteſtatem dedit coram ſe in Eccleſia Evangelium prædicandi, ac frequentiſſime tractandi, contra uſum quidem ac conſuetudinem Africanarum Eccleſiarum. Unde etiam ei nonnulli Epiſcopi detrahebant ——Poſtea bono præcedente exemplo, accepta ab Epiſcopis Poteſtate, Presbyteri nonnulli coram Epiſcopis populo tractare cœperunt verbum Dei.

dius

dius [*n*] obſerves, when he ſays *Valerius* brought the Cuſtom into *Africk* from their Example: And St. *Jerom* intimates as much, when he complains [*o*] of it as an ill Cuſtom only in ſome Churches to forbid Presbyters to preach. *Chryſoſtom* preached ſeveral of his Elaborate Diſcourſes at *Antioch* whilſt he was but a Presbyter, and ſo did *Atticus* [*p*] at *Conſtantinople*: And the ſame is obſerved to have been granted to the Presbyters [*q*] of *Alexandria*, and *Cæſarea*, in *Cappadocia* [*r*] and *Cyprus*, and other Places. But ſtill it was but a Grant of the Biſhops, and Presbyters did it by their Authority and Commiſſion: And whenever Biſhops ſaw juſt Reaſon to forbid them, they had Power to limit or withdraw their Commiſſion again: As both *Socrates* [*s*] and *Sozomen* [*t*] teſtify, who ſay that at *Alexandria* Presbyters were forbidden to preach, from the Time that *Arius* raiſed a Diſturbance in the Church. Thus we ſee what Power Biſhops anciently challenged and exerciſed over Presbyters in the common and ordinary Offices of the Church: Particularly for preaching, Biſhops always eſteemed it their Office, as much as any other. Such a vaſt difference was there between the Practice of the Primitive Church and the Biſhops of *Rome* in After-Ages! When, as *Blondel* obſerves out of *Surius*, there was a time when the Biſhops of *Rome* were not known to preach for Five hundred Years together: Inſomuch that when *Pius Quintus* made a Sermon, it was lookt upon as a Prodigy, and was indeed a greater Rarity than the *Sæculares Ludi* were in Old *Rome*. See *Blondel* Apolog. p. 58. and *Surius Comment. Rer. in Orbe geſtar.*

[*n*] Ille in Orientalibus Eccleſiis id ex more fieri ſciens, obtrectantium non curabat Linguas, &c. Poſſid ibid. [*o*] Peſſimæ conſuetudinis eſt in quibuſdam Eccleſiis tacere Presbyteros, & præſentibus Epiſcopis non loqui *&c.* [*p*] Socrat Lib. 7. c. 2.
[*q*] Theodor Lib. 1. c. 2. [*r*] Socrat. Lib. 5. c. 22.
[*s*] Socrat. ibid. [*t*] Sozom Lib. 7. c. 17. But

Sect. 5.

2. The Office and Power of Ordination never intrusted in the hands of Presbyters.

But to return to the Bishops of the Primitive Church. There were other Offices, which they very rarely intrusted in the hands of Presbyters; and if ever they granted them Commission to perform them, it was only in Cases of great Necessity: Such were the Offices of Reconciling Penitents, Confirmation of *Neophytes*, Consecration of Churches, Virgins and Widows, with some others of the like Nature; of which I shall speak nothing more particularly here now, because they will come more properly under Consideration in other Places. But there was one Office which they never intrusted in the Hands of Presbyters, nor ever gave them any Commission to perform; which was the Office of Ordaining the Superior Clergy, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. The utmost that Presbyters could pretend to in this matter, was to lay on their hands together with the Bishop in the Ordination of a Presbyter, whilst the Bishop by his Prayer performed the Office of Consecration. Thus much is allowed them by one of the Councils [*u*] of *Carthage*, which yet expressly reserves the Benediction or Ordination-Prayer to the Bishop only. In the Ordination of Bishops they had no concern at all; which was always performed by a Synod of Bishops, as shall be shewed more particularly when we come to speak of the Rites and Customs observed in their Ordinations. Here in this place it will be sufficient to prove in general, that the Power of Ordinations was the Prerogative of Bishops, and that they never communicated this Privilege to any Presbyters. St. *Jerom's*

[*u*] Con. Carth. 4. can. 3. Presbyter cum ordinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente, & manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant.

[*uu*] Teſtimony is irrefragable Evidence in this Caſe. For in the ſame place where he ſets off the Office of Presbyters to the beſt Advantage, he ſtill excepts the Power of Ordination. What is it, ſays he, that a Biſhop does more than a Presbyter, ſetting aſide the Buſineſs of Ordination? St. *Chryſoſtom* [*w*] ſpeaks much after the ſame manner, where he advances the Power of Presbyters to the higheſt. Biſhops and Presbyters, ſays he, differ not much from one another. For Presbyters are admitted to preach and govern the Church: And the ſame Qualifications that the Apoſtle requires in Biſhops, are required in Presbyters alſo. For Biſhops are Superior to them only in the Power of Ordination, and have that one thing more than they. In another place [*x*] he proves that *Timothy* was a Biſhop, becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of his Power to ordain, bidding him lay hands ſuddenly on no Man. And he adds both there and elſewhere [*y*] that the Presbytery which ordained *Timothy* was a Synod of Biſhops, becauſe mere Presbyters had no Power to Ordain a Biſhop. I might here produce all thoſe Canons of the ancient Councils, which ſpeak of Biſhops Ordaining [*z*], but never of Presbyters; which Rule was ſo preciſely obſerved in the Primitive Church, that *Novatian* himſelf would not preſume to break it, but ſent for Three Biſhops [*a*] from the fartheſt Corners of *Italy*, rather than want a Canonical Number of Biſhops to Ordain him. I only add that Obſervation of *Epiphanius* [*aa*], grounded upon the general Practice of the Church,

[*uu*] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Quid enim facit, excepta Ordinatione, Epiſcopus, quod Presbyter non facit?

[*w*] Chryſ. Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. 3. 8. [*x*] Id. Hom. 1. in Philip. 1. [*y*] Hom. 13. in 1 Tim. 4. 14. ὃ γὰρ δὴ πρεσβύτερος ἐπίσκοπον ἐχειροτόνει. [*z*] *See* Con. Nic. c. 19. Con. Antioch. c. 9. Con Chalced. c. 2, & 6. Con. Carth. 3. c. 45. Can. Apoſt. c. 1. [*a*] Cornel. Ep. ad Fabium ap. Euſeb. Lib. 6. c. 23.

[*aa*] Epiph. Hær. 75. Aerian.

That

That the Order of Biſhops begets Fathers to the Church, which the Order of Presbyters cannot do, but only begets Sons by the Regeneration of Baptiſm.

I know, ſome urge the Authority of St. *Jerom* [b] to prove, that the Presbyters of *Alexandria* Ordained their own Biſhop, from the Days of St. *Mark* to the time of *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*; and others think the ſame Words prove that he had no new Ordination at all: But they both miſtake St. *Jerom*'s Meaning, who ſpeaks not of the Ordination of the Biſhop, but of his Election; who was choſen by the Presbyters, out of their own Body, and by them placed upon the Biſhop's Throne; which in thoſe Days was no more than a Token of his Election, and was ſometimes done by the People; but the Ordination came after that, and was always reſerved for the Provincial Biſhops to perform, as ſhall be ſhewed hereafter.

Sect. 6. *Ordinations by Preſbyters diſannulled by the Church.*

But it may be enquired, what was the Practice of the Church in caſe any Presbyters took upon them to Ordain? Were their Ordinations allowed to ſtand good or not? I Anſwer, They were commonly reverſed and diſannulled. As in the known Caſe of *Iſchyras* [c] who was depoſed by the Synod of *Alexandria*, becauſe *Colluthus* who ordained him, was no more than a Presbyter, though pretending to be a Biſhop: And in the Caſe of thoſe Presbyters who were reduced to the Quality of Laymen by the Council [d] of *Sardica*, becauſe *Eutychianus* and *Muſæus* who Ordained

[b] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Alexandriæ à Marco Evangeliſta uſque ad Heraclam & Dionyſium Epiſcopos, Presbyteri ſemper unum ex ſe electum, in excelſiori gradu collocatum Epiſcopum nominabant; quomodo ſi Exercitus Imperatorem faciat.

[c] Athan. Apol. 2. p. 732. Epiſt. Cler. Mareot. ibid. p. 784.

[d] Con. Sard. Can. 20.

them, were only pretended Biſhops. The Council of *Sevil* in *Spain* [e] went a little farther: They depoſed a Presbyter and Two Deacons, becauſe the Biſhop only laid his hands upon them, whilſt a Preſbyter pronounced the Bleſſing or Conſecration-Prayer over them. And ſome other Inſtances might be added of the like Nature, which ſhew that then they did not allow Biſhops ſo much as to delegate or Commiſſion Presbyters to Ordain in their Name, but reſerved this entirely to the Epiſcopal Function.

Sect. 7. *Some Allegations to the contrary examined.*

The common Pleas which ſome urge to the contrary, derogate nothing from the Truth of this Obſervation. For whereas it is ſaid, 1ſt. That the *Chorepiſcopi* were only Preſbyters, and yet had Power to Ordain: That ſeems to be a plain miſtake; for all the *Chorepiſcopi* of the Ancient Church were real Biſhops, tho' Subordinate to other Biſhops; as I will ſhew more particularly hereafter, when I come to ſpeak of their Order. 2. It is ſaid, That the City-Presbyters had Power to Ordain by the Biſhop's Licenſe; and that this was eſtabliſhed by Canon in the Council of [f] *Ancyra*. But this is grounded only upon a very ambiguous Senſe, if not a corrupt Reading of that Canon. For all the old Tranſlators render it much otherwiſe, That the City-Presbyters ſhall do nothing [g] without the Licenſe and Authority of the Biſhop, in any part of

[e] Con. Hiſpal. 2. Can. 5. Relatum eſt nobis de quibuſdam Clericis, quorum dum unus ad Presbyterum, duo ad Levitarum miniſterium ſacrarentur, Epiſcopus oculorum dolore detentus fertur manum ſuam ſuper eos tantum impoſuiſſe, & Presbyter quidam illis contra Eccleſiaſticum ordinem Benedictionem dediſſe, &c. Hi gradum Sacerdotii vel Levitici ordinis, quem perverſe adepti ſunt, amittunt. [f] Con. Ancy. can. 13.

[g] Id. ex Verſione Dionyſii Exigui: Sed nec Presbyteris Civitatis, ſine Præcepto Epiſcopi, amplius aliquid imperare, nec the

the Paroche or Dioceſe belonging to his Juriſdiction. Which agrees with what I have cited before out of the Council of *Laodicea*; and ſeveral other Canons, which make Presbyters Dependent upon their Biſhops in the ordinary Exerciſe of their Function. (See before Sect. 2. of this Chapter.) And ſome *Greek* Copies [*h*] read it, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ, which ſeems to ſignify that Presbyters ſhall not officiate in another Dioceſe without Letters Dimiſſory from their own Biſhop.

3. It is urged further, that *Novatus*, a Presbyter of *Carthage*, Ordained *Felicisſimus* a Deacon. But this ſeems to be no more than procuring him to be Ordained by ſome Biſhop. For *Cyprian* ſays, he made *Novatian* [*i*] Biſhop of *Rome* after the ſame manner as he had done *Felicisſimus* Deacon at *Carthage*. But now it is certain he did not Ordain *Novatian*, but only was inſtrumental in procuring Three obſcure *Italian* Biſhops to come and Ordain him. And in that Senſe he might Ordain *Felicisſimus* too. But admit it were otherwiſe, it was only a Schiſmatical Act, condemned by *Cyprian* and the whole Church.

4. 'Tis pleaded out of *Caſſian*, That *Paphnutius* an *Egyptian* Abbot, Ordained one *Daniel* a Presbyter. But, if *Caſſian*'s Words be rightly conſidered, he ſays no ſuch thing, but only [*k*] that *Paphnutius* firſt promoted him to be made a Deacon before ſeveral of his Seniors, and then intending to make him his Suc-

ſine authoritate Literarum ejus in unaquaque Parochia aliquid agere. [*h*] Cod. Can. edit. Ehinger. [*i*] Cypr. Ep. 49. al. 52. ad Cornel. p. 97. ed. Oxon. Quoniam pro magnitudine ſua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere, illic majora & graviora commiſit. Qui iſtic adverſus Eccleſiam Diaconum fecerat, illic Epiſcopum fecit. [*k*] Caſſian. Collat. 4. c. 1. A beato Paphnutio ſolitudinis ejuſdem Presbytero, & quidem cum multis junior eſſet ætate, ad Diaconii eſt prælatus Officium. ——— . Optanſque ſibimet ſucceſſorem digniſſimum providere, ſuperſtes eum Presbyterii honore provexit.

ceſſor, he alſo preferred him to the Dignity of a Presbyter. Which Preference or Promotion does not at all exclude the Biſhop's Ordination. It may reaſonably ſignify the Abbot's Choice, which he had Power to make; but it cannot ſo reaſonably be interpreted that he Ordained him; ſince this was contrary to the Rules and Practice of the Church: And conſidering where and when *Paphnutius* lived, in the midſt of *Egypt*, among an hundred Biſhops, in the Fifth Century, it is not likely he would trangreſs the Canons in ſo plain a Caſe. Therefore I cannot ſubſcribe to a Learned Man [*l*], who ſays, Nothing is more plain and evident, than that here a Presbyter Ordained a Presbyter, which we no where read was pronounced Null by *Theophilus* then Biſhop of *Alexandria*, nor any other at that time. I conceive, the contrary was rather evident to them, and therefore they had no Reaſon to pronounce it Null, knowing it to be a juſt and regular Ordination.

5. I remember but one Inſtance more in Ancient Church-Hiſtory (for Modern Inſtances I wholly paſs by) that ſeems to make any thing for the Ordination of Presbyters; and that is in the Anſwer given by Pope *Leo* to a Queſtion put to him by *Ruſticus Narbonenſis*, Whether the Ordination of certain Perſons might ſtand good, who were only Ordained by ſome *Pſeudo-Epiſcopi*, Falſe Biſhops, who had no Legal and Canonical Right to their Places? To this he Anſwers, [*m*] That if the Lawful Biſhops of thoſe Churches gave their Conſent to their Ordination, it might be eſteemed valid and allowed; otherwiſe to be diſannulled. But here it is to be conſi-

[*l*] Stilling. Irenic. Par. 2. c. 7. n. 8. p. 380. [*m*] Leo Ep. 92 ad Ruſtic. c. 1. Si qui autem Clerici ab iſtis Pſeudo-epiſcopis in eis Eccleſiis ordinati ſunt, quæ ad proprios Epiſcopos pertinebant, & Ordinatio eorum cum Conſenſu & Judicio Præſidentium facta eſt, poteſt rata haberi, &c.

dered

dered that these *Pseudo-Episcopi* were in some Sense Bishops, as being Ordained, though illegally, to their Places: For they seem to be such as had Schismatically intruded themselves into other Men's Sees, or at least obtained them by some corrupt and irregular Practices. Now the Church did not always rescind and cancel the Acts of such Bishops, but used a Liberty either to reverse and disannul the Ordinations made by them, or otherwise to confirm and ratify them, as She saw occasion. Therefore though the General Council [n] of *Constantinople* deposed all such as were Ordained by *Maximus*, who had simoniacally intruded himself into *Gregory Nazianzen*'s See at *Constantinople*; yet the *Novatian* Clergy were admitted by the Council of *Nice* [o], though Ordained by Schismatical Bishops; and the *African* Councils [p] allowed the Ordinations of the *Donatist* Bishops, tho' they had long continued in Schism, and given Schismatical Orders to others also. Which shews that the Primitive Church made some difference between Orders conferred by Schismatical Bishops, and those conferred by mere Presbyters. I enquire not now into the Grounds and Reasons of this, but only relate the Churches Practice. From which upon the whole matter it appears, that this was another Difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, that the one had power to Ordain, but the other were never authorized or commissioned to do it.

Sect. 8.
A 3d Difference between Bishops and Presbyters: Presby-

3. Besides this, there was a Third Difference between Bishops and Presbyters in point of Jurisdiction: Bishops always retained to them-

[n] Con. Constant. can. 4.
[o] Con. Nic. c. 8.
[p] Collat. Carthag. 1. Die. c. 16.

ceſſor, he alſo preferred him to the Dignity of a Presbyter. Which Preference or Promotion does not at all exclude the Biſhop's Ordination. It may reaſonably ſignify the Abbot's Choice, which he had Power to make; but it cannot ſo reaſonably be interpreted that he Ordained him; ſince this was contrary to the Rules and Practice of the Church: And conſidering where and when *Paphnutius* lived, in the midſt of *Egypt*, among an hundred Biſhops, in the Fifth Century, it is not likely he would trangreſs the Canons in ſo plain a Caſe. Therefore I cannot ſubſcribe to a Learned Man [*l*], who ſays, Nothing is more plain and evident, than that here a Presbyter Ordained a Presbyter, which we no where read was pronounced Null by *Theophilus* then Biſhop of *Alexandria*, nor any other at that time. I conceive, the contrary was rather evident to them, and therefore they had no Reaſon to pronounce it Null, knowing it to be a juſt and regular Ordination.

5. I remember but one Inſtance more in Ancient Church-Hiſtory (for Modern Inſtances I wholly paſs by) that ſeems to make any thing for the Ordination of Presbyters; and that is in the Anſwer given by Pope *Leo* to a Queſtion put to him by *Ruſticus Narbonenſis*, Whether the Ordination of certain Perſons might ſtand good, who were only Ordained by ſome *Pſeudo-Epiſcopi*, Falſe Biſhops, who had no Legal and Canonical Right to their Places? To this he Anſwers, [*m*] That if the Lawful Biſhops of thoſe Churches gave their Conſent to their Ordination, it might be eſteemed valid and allowed; otherwiſe to be diſannulled. But here it is to be conſi-

[*l*] Stilling. Irenic. Par. 2. c. 7. n. 8. p. 380. [*m*] Leo Ep. 92 ad Ruſtic. c. 1. Si qui autem Clerici ab iſtis Pſeudo-epiſcopis in eis Eccleſiis ordinati ſunt, quæ ad proprios Epiſcopos pertinebant, & Ordinatio eorum cum Conſenſu & Judicio Præſidentium facta eſt, poteſt rata haberi, &c.

dered

dered that these *Pseudo-Episcopi* were in some Sense Bishops, as being Ordained, though illegally, to their Places: For they seem to be such as had Schismatically intruded themselves into other Men's Sees, or at least obtained them by some corrupt and irregular Practices. Now the Church did not always rescind and cancel the Acts of such Bishops, but used a Liberty either to reverse and disannul the Ordinations made by them, or otherwise to confirm and ratify them, as She saw occasion. Therefore though the General Council [n] of *Constantinople* deposed all such as were Ordained by *Maximus*, who had simoniacally intruded himself into *Gregory Nazianzen*'s See at *Constantinople*; yet the *Novatian* Clergy were admitted by the Council of *Nice* [o], though Ordained by Schismatical Bishops; and the *African* Councils [p] allowed the Ordinations of the *Donatist* Bishops, tho' they had long continued in Schism, and given Schismatical Orders to others also. Which shews that the Primitive Church made some difference between Orders conferred by Schismatical Bishops, and those conferred by mere Presbyters. I enquire not now into the Grounds and Reasons of this, but only relate the Churches Practice. From which upon the whole matter it appears, that this was another Difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, that the one had power to Ordain, but the other were never authorized or commissioned to do it.

Sect. 8.
A 3d Difference between Bishops and Presbyters: Presby-

3. Besides this, there was a Third Difference between Bishops and Presbyters in point of Jurisdiction: Bishops always retained to them-

[n] Con. Constant. can. 4.
[o] Con. Nic. c. 8.
[p] Collat. Carthag. 1. Die. c. 16.

ters accountable to their Biſhops, not Biſhops to their Presbyters.

ſelves the Power of calling Preſbyters to an Account, and Cenſuring them for their Miſcarriages in the Diſcharge of their Office; but Presbyters had no Power to cenſure their Biſhops, or ſet up an Independent Power in oppoſition to their Authority and Juriſdiction. When *Feliciſſimus* and *Augendus* ſet up a ſeparate Communion at *Carthage* againſt *Cyprian*, threatning to excommunicate all that communicated with him, *Cyprian* gave Orders to his Deputies (being himſelf then in Baniſhment) to execute firſt their own Sentence upon them, and let them for their Contempt of him and the Church [q] feel the power of Excommunication; which was accordingly done by his Delegates, as appears from their Anſwer [r] to him. In another place, writing to *Rogatian* a Biſhop, who made Complaint to *Cyprian* and the Synod, of an unruly Deacon; he tells him, It was his ſingular Modeſty to refer the Caſe to them, when he might by virtue of his own Epiſcopal Authority himſelf have puniſhed the [s] Delinquent; againſt whom, if he perſiſted in his Contempt, he ſhould uſe the Power which belonged to his Order, and either depoſe or ſuſpend him. Nothing can be more plain and evident, than that in *Cyprian*'s Time all Biſhops were inveſted with this Power of Cenſuring Delinquents among the

[q] Cypr. Ep. 38. al. 41. p. 80. Cum Feliciſſimus comminatus ſit, non communicaturos in Monte (al Morte) ſecum, qui nobis communicarent. Accipiat ſententiam quam prior dixit, ut abſtentum à ſe nobis ſciat. [r] Ep. 39. al. 42. ad Cypr. Abſtinuimus Communicatione Feliciſſimum & Augendum, &c.

[s] Cypr. Ep. 65. al. 3. ad Rogatian. Tu quidem pro ſolita tua humilitate feciſti, ut malles de eo nobis conqueri, cum pro Epiſcopatus vigore & Cathedræ auctoritate haberes poteſtatem, qua poſſes de illo ſtatim vindicari - - - - - Quod ſi ultra te contumeliis ſuis provocaverit, fungeris circa eum Poteſtate honoris tui, uteum vel deponas vel abſtineas. *See alſo* Cypr. Ep. 10. al. 16. ed. Oxon.

Clergy.

Clergy. And any one that looks into the Councils of the following Age, will find nothing more common, than Canons, which both ſuppoſe and confirm this Power. As when the Apoſtolical Canons ſay [w], That no Presbyter, or Deacon, excommunicated by his own Biſhop, ſhould be received by any other; that ſuppoſes all Biſhops to have Power to inflict Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures upon their Clergy. The like may be ſeen in the Canons of the Council of *Nice* [x], which allows an Appeal in ſuch a Caſe to a Provincial Synod; and the Council of *Sardica* [y], which orders the Metropolitan to hear and redreſs the Grievance: So alſo in the Councils of *Antioch* [z], *Chalcedon* [a], and many others.

Sect. 9. *Yet Biſhops Power not Arbitrary, but limited by Canon in various Reſpects.*

Yet it muſt be own'd, that according to the Diſcipline and Cuſtom of thoſe Times, Biſhops ſeldom did any thing of this nature, without the Advice and Conſent of their Presbyters, who were their Aſſeſſors, and (as it were) the Eccleſiaſtical Senate and Council of the Church: Of which I ſhall give a more particular Account, when I come to ſpeak of the Honour and Privileges of the Order of Presbyters. And here it is to be further noted out of the preceeding Canons, That if any Clergyman thought himſelf injur'd by his Biſhop, he had Liberty to appeal [b] either to the Metropolitan, or a Provincial Synod: And in ſome Places, the better to avoid Arbitrary Power, the Canons provided, That no Biſhop ſhould proceed to cenſure a Presbyter, or Deacon, without the Concurrence of ſome

[w] Canon Apoſt. c. 33. [x] Con. Nic. Can. 5.
[y] Con. Sard. Can. 13, 14. [z] Con. Antioch. Can. 3, & 4.
[a] Chalced. Can. 9. [b] *See for the Liberty of Appeals:* Con. Carthag. 2. c. 8. Carthag. 4. c. 29, & 66. Antioch. c. 12. Vaſion. c. 5. Venetic. Can. 9.

Neigh-

Neighbouring Biſhops to join with him in the Sentence. The firſt Council of *Carthage* [*c*] requires Three to cenſure a Deacon, and Six to cenſure a Presbyter. The Second Council of *Carthage* [*d*] requires the ſame Number, according to all correct Editions of it: For *Crab*'s Edition is palpably falſe; and yet *Blondel* [*e*] lays hold of that Corruption, to prove that Presbyters and Deacons were to be Judges of their own Biſhop; which makes the Canon ſpeak mere Nonſenſe, and appoints the Biſhop to judge himſelf alſo. The true Reading of the Canon is this: The Criminal Cauſe of a Biſhop ſhall be heard by Twelve Biſhops; the Cauſe of a Presbyter, by Six; the Cauſe of a Deacon, by Three joined with his own Biſhop. This obliges every Biſhop to take other Biſhops into Commiſſion with him in Criminal Cauſes, but does not authorize Presbyters and Deacons to ſit as Judges upon their own Biſhop. Which may be farther evidenced from another Canon [*f*] of the next Council of *Carthage*; which ſpeaks of a Legal Number of Biſhops to judge a Presbyter, or Deacon; and aſſigns Six for a Presbyter, and Three for a Deacon, as the former Canons appointed. But for the inferior Clergy, there was no ſuch Reſtraint laid upon the Biſhop, that I can find; but he alone, by the ſame Canon [*g*], is

[*c*] Con. Carthag. 1. Can. 11. Si quis aliquam Cauſam habuerit, à tribus vicinis Epiſcopis, ſi Diaconus eſt, arguatur: Preſbyter à ſex. [*d*] Con. Carth 2. Can 10. Placet ut Cauſa criminalis Epiſcopi à duodecim Epiſcopis audiatur; Cauſa Preſbyteri à ſex; Cauſa vero Diaconi a tribus cum proprio Epiſcopo.

[*e*] Blondel. Apol. p 137. *And* Crab *thus reads it corruptly*: Epiſcopus à duodecim Epiſcopis audiatur, & à ſexPresbyteris, & à tribus Diaconibus cum proprio ſuo Epiſcopo.

[*f*] Con. Carth. 3. c. 8. Si Presbyteri vel Diaconi fuerint accuſati, adjuncto ſibi ex vicinis locis Legitimo numero Collegarum ----in Presbyteri nomine ſex, in Diaconi tribus, ipſorum Cauſas diſcutiant. [*g*] Ibid. c. 8. Reliquorum Clericorum Cauſas ſolus Epiſcopus loci agnoſcat & finiat.

allowed

allowed to hear their Cauſes, and end them. Only they had Liberty to appeal, as all others, in caſe of Injury done them, to the Metropolitan, or a Provincial Synod; which the *Nicene* Council [*b*], and many others, appoint to be held once or twice a Year for that very purpoſe; That if any Clergyman chanced to be unjuſtly cenſured by the Paſſion of his Biſhop, he might have recourſe to a Superior Court, and there have Juſtice done him. This is the true State and Account of the Power of Biſhops over their Clergy, as near as I can collect it out of the Genuine Records of the Ancient Church.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Power of Biſhops over the Laity, Monks, Subordinate Magiſtrates, and all Perſons within their Dioceſe: And of their Office in diſpoſing of the Revenues of the Church.

Sect. 1. *No Exemptions from the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop in the Primitive Church.*

THE next thing to be conſidered, is, The Power of Biſhops over the People; which, upon Enquiry, will be found to extend it ſelf over all Perſons, of what Rank or Quality ſoever, within their Dioceſe, or the Bounds and Limits of their Juriſdiction. The Extent of Dioceſes themſelves, and the Reaſons why ſome were much greater than others, I do not here conſider; but reſerve that for a more proper Place, to be treated of when we come to ſpeak of Churches. What I obſerve in

[*b*] Con. Nic. Can. 5.

this

this place, is, That all Orders of Men within the Dioceſe, were ſubject to the Biſhop: For, Privileges to exempt Men from the Juriſdiction of their Dioceſan, were Things unknown to former Ages. *Ignatius* makes bold to ſay [*i*], That as he that honours his Biſhop, is honoured of God; ſo he that does any thing covertly in Oppoſition to him, is the Servant of Satan. And *Cyprian* defines the Church [*k*] to be a People united to its Biſhop, a Flock adhering to its Paſtor. Whence the Church may be ſaid to be in the Biſhop, and the Biſhop in the Church; and if any are not with their Biſhop, they are not in the Church.

Sect. 2. *All Monks ſubject to the Biſhop of the Dioceſe where they lived.*

Particularly, we may obſerve of all Aſceticks, and Monks, and Hermits; That the Laws, both Eccleſiaſtical and Civil, ſubjected them to the Biſhop of the Place where they lived. For Eccleſiaſtical Laws, we have Two Canons in the Council of *Chalcedon* [*l*] to this purpoſe: The firſt of which preſcribes, That all Monks, whether in City or Country, ſhall be ſubject to the Biſhop, and concern themſelves in no Buſineſs (Sacred or Civil) out of their own Monaſtery; except they have his Licenſe and Permiſſion, upon urgent Occaſion ſo to do. And if any withdraw themſelves from his Obedience, the other Canon pronounces Excommunication againſt them. The ſame Injunctions may be read in the Councils of *Orleans* [*m*], *Agde* [*n*], *Lerida* [*o*],

[*i*] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 9. ὁ λάθρα ἐπισκόπε τὶ πράσσων, τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει. [*k*] Cypr. Epiſt. 69. al. 66. ad Pupian. p. 168. Eccleſia Plebs Sacerdoti unita, & Paſtori ſuo Grex adhærens. Unde ſcire debes Epiſcopum in Eccleſia eſſe, & Eccleſiam in Epiſcopo; Et ſi qui cum Epiſcopo non ſint, in Eccleſia non eſſe, &c. [*l*] Con. Chalced. Can. 4, & 8. [*m*] Con. Aurel. 1. c. 21. [*n*] Agathenſ. Can. 38. [*o*] Ilerdenſ. c. 3.

and

and others; which ſubject the Abbots as well as Monks to the Biſhop's Care and Correction. *Juſtinian* confirms all this by a Law in the Code; which ſays [p], All Monaſteries are to be reckoned under the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop of the Territories where they are; and that the Abbots themſelves are part of their Care. In one of his Novels [q], the Election of Abbots is put into the Biſhop's Hands. And by other Laws [r], no new Cells, or Monaſteries, were to be erected, but by the Conſent and Licenſe of the Biſhop, to whoſe Juriſdiction they belonged. It is therefore a very juſt Reflection, which *Bede*, and ſome others [s] from him, make upon the State of the *Scottiſh* Church; That Things were in a very unuſual and prepoſterous Order, when inſtead of Abbots being ſubject to the Biſhops, the Biſhops were ſubject to a ſingle Abbot. This was *Ordine inuſitato*, as *Bede* [t] rightly obſerves: For there was no ſuch Practice allowed in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 3. *As alſo all ſubordinate Magiſtrates in Matters of Spiritual Juriſdiction.*

In thoſe days, the Authority of Biſhops was ſo highly eſteemed, and venerable in the Eyes of all Men, that even the Subordinate Magiſtrates themſelves were ſubject to their Spiritual Diſcipline and Correction. The Prefects and Governors of Cities and Provinces, were obliged to take their Communicatory Letters along with them to the Biſhop of the Place, whither the Government ſent them; and whilſt they continued in their Office

[p] Cod. Juſt. Lib. 1. Tit. 3. de Epiſcop. Leg. 40.
[q] Juſtin. Novel. 5. c. 9. [r] Con. Chalced. Can. 4. Con. Agath. c. 58. [s] Pearſon. Vind. Ignat. Part 1. c. 11. p. 333.
[t] Bed. Hiſt. Gent. Anglor. Lib. 3. c. 4. Cujus juri & omnis Provincia, & ipſi etiam Epiſcopi Ordine inuſitato debeant eſſe ſubjecti.

there,

there, they were to be under the Biſhop's Care; who, if they tranſgreſſed againſt the publick Diſcipline of the Church, was authorized by the Imperial Laws to puniſh them with Excommunication. This we learn from a Canon of the firſt Council of *Arles* [u]; which was called by *Conſtantine* himſelf, who ratify'd its Canons, and gave them as it were the Force of Imperial Sanctions. And by Virtue of this Power, they ſometimes unſheathed the Spiritual Sword againſt Impious and Prophane Magiſtrates, and cut them off from all Communion with the Church. Of which we have an Inſtance in *Syneſius* Biſhop of *Ptolemais* [w], excommunicating *Andronicus* the Governor, for his Cruelties and Blaſphemies; and many other ſuch Examples, which will be mentioned when we come to treat particularly of the Diſcipline of the Church. As to what concerns the Biſhops Power to inſpect and examine the Acts and Decrees of Subordinate Magiſtrates; *Socrates* [x] aſſures us it was practiſed by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, in reference to *Oreſtes* the *Præfectus Auguſtalis* of *Egypt*; tho', as he intimates, it was ſome Grievance to him to be under his Inſpection.

Sect. 4
Of the Diſtinction between Temporal and Spiritual Juriſdiction; Biſhops Power wholly confined to the latter.

But it muſt be owned and ſpoken to the Glory of thoſe Primitive Biſhops, that they challenged no Power, as of Right belonging to them, but only that which was Spiritual. They did not as yet lay claim to both Swords, much leſs

[u] Con. Arelat. 2. c. 7. De Præſidibus - - - - ita placuit, ut cum promoti fuerint, Literas accipiant Eccleſiaſticas Communicatorias: Ita tamen ut in quibuſcunq; locis geſſerint, ab Epiſcopo ejuſdem loci Cura de illis agatur; at cum cœperint contra Diſciplinam publicam agere, tunc demum à Communione excludantur. Similiter & de his fiat, qui Rempublicam agere volunt. [w] Syneſ. Ep. 58. ad Epiſcopos, p. 198. [x] Socrat. Lib. 7. c. 13.

endea-

endeavour to wreſt the Temporal Sword out of the Magiſtrates Hand, and dethrone Princes under pretence of Excommunication. The ancient Biſhops of *Rome* themſelves, always profeſſed Obedience and Subjection to the Emperor's Laws: Which I ſhall not ſtand here to prove, ſince it has ſo frequently and ſo ſubſtantially been done by ſeveral of our Learned [*y*] Writers: And it is confeſſed by the more Ingenuous of the *Romiſh* Writers [*z*] themſelves, That *Gregory* the VIIth was the Firſt Pope that pretended to depoſe Chriſtian Princes. The ancient Biſhops of the Church laid no Claim to a Coercive Power over the Bodies or Eſtates of Men; but if ever they had occaſion to make uſe of it, they applied themſelves to the Secular Magiſtrate, for his Aſſiſtance. As in the Caſe of *Paulus Samoſatenſis*, who kept poſſeſſion of the Biſhop's Houſe, after he was depoſed from his Biſhoprick by the Council of *Antioch*. The Fathers in that Council having no Power to remove him, petitioned the Emperor *Aurelian* [*a*] againſt him; who, tho' an Heathen, gave Judgment on their ſide, and ordered his Officers to ſee his Sentence put in Execution. And thus the Caſe ſtood, as to the Power of Biſhops, for ſome Ages after under Chriſtian Emperors: Inſomuch that *Socrates* [*b*] notes it as a very ſingular thing in *Cyril* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, That he undertook by his own Power to ſhut up the *Novatian* Churches, ſeizing upon their Plate and Sacred Utenſils and depriving their Biſhop *Theopemptus* of his Subſtance. This was done παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν τάξεως,

[*y*] *See Biſhop* Morton's *Grand Impoſt. of the Church of* Rome, c. 11. Joh. Roſſenſ. de Poteſt. Papæ in Temporal. Lib. 2. c. 2.

[*z*] Otho Friſingenſ. Chron. Lib. 6. c. 35. Greg. Tholoſan. de Repub. Lib. 26. c. 5. [*a*] Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 30. [*b*] Socrat. Lib. 7. c. 7.

beyond

beyond any ordinary Power that Biſhops were then inveſted with: And tho' in After-ages they attained to this Power, yet it was not by any inherent Right of their Order, but by the Favour and Indulgence of Secular Princes. It muſt here alſo be farther noted, That it was ever eſteemed diſhonourable for Biſhops, ſo much as to petition the Secular Power againſt the Life of any Man, whom they had condemned by Spiritual Cenſures. And therefore, when *Ithacius* and ſome other *Spaniſh* Biſhops prevailed with *Maximus* to ſlay the Heretick *Priſcillian*, St. *Martin* and many other pious Biſhops, petitioned againſt it, ſaying, It was enough to expel Hereticks [c] from the Churches: And when they could not prevail, they ſhewed their Reſentments of the Fact againſt the Author of it, refuſing to admit *Ithacius* the Sanguinary Biſhop to their Communion. So great a Concern had thoſe Holy Men to keep within the Bounds of their Spiritual Juriſdiction!

Sect. 5. *An Account of the* Literæ Formatæ, *and the Biſhop's Prerogative in granting them to all Perſons.*

And it may be obſerved, that the Authority of Biſhops was never greater in the World, than when they concerned themſelves only in the Exerciſe of their own proper Spiritual Power. For then they had an univerſal Reſpect paid them by all ſorts of Men; inſomuch that no Chriſtian would pretend to travel, without taking Letters of Credence with him from his own Biſhop, if he meant to communicate with the Chriſtian Church in a Foreign Country. Such was the admirable Unity of the Church Catholick in thoſe days, and the Bleſſed Harmony and Conſent of her Biſhops among one

[c] Sulp. Sever. Lib. 2. p. 119. Maximum orare, ut Sanguine Infelicium abſtineret: Satis ſuperque ſufficere, ut Epiſcopali ſententia Hæretici judicati Eccleſiis pellerentur.

ano-

another! These Letters were of divers sorts, according to the different Occasions or Quality of the Persons that carried them. They are generally reduced to Three Kinds; The *Epistolæ Commendatoriæ*, *Communicatoriæ*, and *Dimissoriæ*. The first were such as were granted only to Persons of Quality, or else Persons whose Reputation had been called in Question, or to the Clergy who had occasion to travel into Foreign Countries. The Second sort were granted to all who were in the Peace and Communion of the Church; whence they were also called *Pacificæ*, and *Ecclesiasticæ*, and sometimes *Canonicæ*. The Third sort were such as were only given to the Clergy, when they were to remove from their own Diocese, and settle in another; and they were to testify that they had their Bishop's Leave to depart; whence they were called *Dimissoriæ*, and sometimes *Pacificæ* likewise. All these went under the general Name of *Formatæ*; because they were written in a peculiar Form, with some particular Marks and Characters, which served as special Signatures to distinguish them from Counterfeits. I shall not stand now to give any further Account of them here, but only observe that it was the Bishop's sole Prerogative to grant them; and none might presume to do it, at least without his Authority and Commission. The Council of *Antioch* [*d*] allows Country-Bishops to write them; but expresly forbids Presbyters the Privilege. And whereas in Times of Persecution, some Confessors who were of great Esteem in the Church, would take upon them to grant such Letters by their own Authority, and in their own Names; the Councils of [*e*] *Arles*, and *Eliberis* [*f*], forbad them to do it; and ordered all

[*d*] Con. Antioch. Can. 8. [*e*] Con. Arelat. 1. c. 9. De his, qui Confessorum Literas offerunt, placuit, ut sublatis eis Literis, alias accipiant Communicatorias. [*f*] Con. Elib. c. 25.

Perſons who had ſuch Letters, to take new Communicatory Letters from the Biſhop. *Baronius* [g], and the common Editors of the Councils, who follow him, miſtake theſe Letters for the Libels which the Confeſſors were uſed to grant to the *Lapſi*, to have them admitted into the Communion of the Church again: But *Albaſpiny* [h] corrects this Miſtake; and rightly obſerves, That thoſe Councils ſpeak not of ſuch Libels as were given to the *Lapſi*, but of ſuch as were given to all Chriſtians, who had occaſion to travel into Foreign Countries; which it belonged to the Biſhops to grant, and not to the Confeſſors, whatever Authority they might otherwiſe have obtained by their Honourable Confeſſion of Chriſt in time of Perſecution. The Council of *Eliberis* [i] takes notice of another Abuſe of this Nature, and corrects it; which was, That ſome Women of famous Renown in the Church; Clergymens Wives, as *Albaſpiny* thinks, or rather the Wives of Biſhops, would preſume both to grant and receive ſuch Letters by their own Authority: All which the Council orders to be ſunk, as being dangerous to the Diſcipline and Communion of the Church, and an Encroachment upon the Biſhops Power, to whom alone it belonged to grant them. For by all ancient Canons, this Privilege is reſerved entirely to Biſhops, and this ſet their Authority very high in the Church: For no one, either Clergy or Laity, could communicate in any Church beſide his own, without theſe Teſtimonials from his Biſhop; as may be ſeen in the Councils of *Carthage* [k], and *Agde* [l], and many others.

[g] Baron. an. 142. Loayſa Not. in Con. Elib. c. 25.
[h] Albaſp. Not. in Con. Elib. c. 25. [i] Con. Elib. c. 81.
[k] Con. Carth. 1. Can. 7. Clericus vel Laicus non communicet in aliena Plebe ſine Literis Epiſcopi ſui. [l] Agath. Can. 52. Epaun. c. 6. Laodic. c. 41. Milevit. c. 20. Con. Antioch. c. 7.

I have

Sect. 6.
Of the Biſhops Power in Diſpoſing of the Revenues of the Church.

I have but one thing more to obſerve concerning the Power of Biſhops over the Church; and that is, their Authority and Concern in Diſpoſing of the Revenues of the Church. I intend not here to enter upon the Diſcourſe of Eccleſiaſtical Revenues, (which has its proper Place in this Work hereafter) but only to ſuggeſt now, That it was part of the Biſhop's Office and Care, to ſee them managed and diſpoſed of to the beſt Advantage. The Councils of *Antioch* [*m*], and *Gangra* [*n*], have ſeveral Canons to this purpoſe; That all the Incomes and Oblations of the Church ſhall be diſpenſed at the Will and Diſcretion of the Biſhop; to whom the People, and the Souls of Men are committed. Thoſe called the Apoſtolical [*o*] Canons, and Conſtitutions [*p*], ſpeak of the ſame Power. And *Cyprian* [*q*] notes, That all who received Maintenance from the Church, had it, *Epiſcopo diſpenſante*, by the Order and Appointment of the Biſhop. He did not indeed always diſpenſe with his own Hands, but by proper Aſſiſtants, ſuch as his Archdeacon, and the *Oeconomus*; which ſome Canons [*r*] order to be one of the Clergy of every Church: But theſe Officers were only Stewards under him, both of his Appointing, as St. *Jerom* [*s*] obſerves, and alſo accountable to him as the Supreme Governor of the Church. Whence *Poſſidius* takes notice of the Practice of St. *Auſtin*; that tho' neither Seal nor Key was ever ſeen in his Hand, but ſome

[*m*] Con. Antioch. c. 24, & 25. [*n*] Con. Gangr. c. 7, & 8. [*o*] Canon. Apoſt. c. 31, & 38. [*p*] Conſtit. Apoſtol. Lib. 2. c. 25. [*q*] Cypr. Ep. 38. al. 41. Juſt. Mart. Apol. 2. [*r*] Con. Chalced, c. 26. [*s*] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Sciat Epiſcopus, cui commiſſa eſt Eccleſia, quem Diſpenſationi Pauperum, Curæq; præficiat.

of his Clergy were always his Administrators; yet he had his certain Times to audit their Accounts: So that all was still his Act, tho' administred and dispensed by the Hands of others. And this was agreeable to the Primitive Rule and Practice of the Apostles, to whose Care and Custody the Peoples Oblations, and Things consecrated to God, were committed: They chose Deacons to be their Assistants, as Bishops did afterwards; still retaining Power in their own Hands to direct and regulate them in the Disposal of the Publick Charity, as Prime Stewards of God's Revenue, and chief Masters of his Houshold.

CHAP. V.

Of the Office of Bishops, in relation to the whole Catholick Church.

Sect. 1. *In what sense every Bishop is supposed to be Bishop of the whole Catholick Church.*

WE have hitherto considered the Office and Power of Bishops over the Clergy and People of their own particular Churches: But there is yet a more eminent Branch of their Pastoral Office and Care behind, which is, their Superintendency over the whole Catholick Church; in which every Bishop was supposed to have an equal Share; not as to what concerned External Polity and Government, but the Prime Essential Part of Religion, the Preservation of the Christian Fath. Whenever the Faith was in danger of being subverted by Heresy, or destroyed by Persecution, then every Bishop thought it part of his Duty and Office to put to his helping Hand, and labour as much for any

any other Dioceſe as his own. Dioceſes were but Limits of Convenience, for the Preſervation of Order in Times of Peace: But the Faith was a more Univerſal Thing; and when War was made upon that, then the whole World was but one Dioceſe, and the whole Church but one Flock; and every Paſtor thought himſelf obliged to feed his great Maſter's Sheep, according to his Power, whatever Part of the World they were ſcattered in. In this Senſe, every Biſhop was an Univerſal Paſtor, and Biſhop of the whole World; as having a common Care and Concern for the whole Church of Chriſt. This is what St. *Auſtin* [t] told *Boniface* Biſhop of *Rome*; That the Paſtoral Care was common to all thoſe who had the Office of Biſhop; and tho' he was a little higher advanced toward the Top of Chriſt's Watch-tower, yet all others had an equal Concern in it. St. *Cyprian* teſtifies [u] for the Practice of his own time, That all Biſhops were ſo united in one Body, that if any of the Body broached any Hereſy, or began to lay waſte and tear the Flock of Chriſt, all the reſt immediately came in to its Reſcue: For though they were many Paſtors, yet they had but one Flock to feed; and every one was obliged to take care of all the Sheep of Chriſt, which he had purchaſed with his Blood. In this Senſe, *Gregory Nazianzen* [w] ſays of *Cyprian*, That

[t] Aug. cont. Epiſt. Pelag. in Præfat. ad Bonifac. Communis eſt nobis omnibus, qui fungimur Epiſcopatus Officio (quamvis ipſe in eo celſiore faſtigio præmineas) Specula Paſtoralis.

[u] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Steph. p. 178. Iccirco copioſum Corpus eſt Sacerdotum, concordiæ mutuæ glutino atq; Unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut ſi quis ex Collegio noſtro Hæreſin facere, & gregem Chriſti lacerare & vaſtare tentaverit, ſubveniant cæteri - - - - Nam etſi Paſtores multi ſumus, unum tamen Gregem paſcimus, & Oves univerſas, quas Chriſtus Sanguine ſuo & Paſſione quæſivit, colligere & fovere debemus. [w] Greg. Naz. Orat. 18. in Laud. Cypr.

he was an Universal Bishop; That he presided not only over the Church of *Carthage* and *Africk*, but over all the Regions of the *West*, and over the *East*, and *South*, and *Northern* Parts of the World also. He says the same of *Athanasius* [x]; That in being made Bishop of *Alexandria*, he was made Bishop of the whole World. Which agrees with St. *Basil*'s Observation [y] concerning him; That he had the Care of all Churches, as much as that which was peculiarly committed to him. *Chrysostom* [z] in like manner stiles *Timothy* Bishop of the Universe: And in compliance with this Customary Character, the Author under the Name of *Clemens Romanus* [zz], gives St. *James* Bishop of *Jerusalem* the Title of Governor of all Churches, as well as that of *Jerusalem*. *Chrysostom* [a] says, St. *Paul* had the whole World committed to his Care, and every City under the Sun; That he was the Teacher [b] of the Universe, and presided [c] over all Churches: Which he repeats in many Places of his Writings. Nor was this Prerogative so peculiar to the Apostles, but that every Bishop (in some measure) had a Right and Title to the same Character.

Sect. 2.
In what Respect the whole World but one Diocese, and but one

Hence came that current Notion, so frequently to be met with in *Cyprian*, of but one Bishoprick in the Church; wherein every

[x] Naz. in Laud. Athan. Or. 21. p. 377. τ̀ οἰκουμένης πάσης ἐπισκοπὴν πιστεύθη. [y] Basil. Ep. 52. ad Athanas.

[z] Chrys. Hom. 6. adv. Jud. T. 1. p. 542. τ̀ τ̀ οἰκουμένης πρεσβείαν ἐγκεχειρισμένον. [zz] Pseudo-Clem. Ep. ad Jacob. ap. Coteler. Patr. Apost. T. 1. p. 611. Clemens Jacobo --- Regenti Hebræorum sanctam Ecclesiam in Hierosolymis; sed & omnes Ecclesias, quæ ubiq; Dei Providentia fundatæ sunt.

[a] Chrys. Hom. 17. in illud, Salutate Priscillam. T. 5. p. 241. τ̀ οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν ἐγκεχειρισμένον, &c. [b] Id. Hom. 6. in Terræmotum & Lazar. T. 5. p. 107. τ̀ οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλον. [c] Id. Hom. 17. in Priscillam. p. 248.

single

ſingle Biſhop had his Share in ſuch a manner, as to have an equal Concern in the whole: *Epiſcopatus unus eſt, cujus à ſingulis in ſolidum pars tenetur.* [d] There is but one Biſhoprick in the Church; and every Biſhop has an undivided Portion in it. He does not ſay, it was a Monarchy, in the Hands of any ſingle Biſhop; but a diffuſive Power, that lay in the whole College of Biſhops [e], every one of which had a Title to feed the whole Church of God, and drive away Hereſy out of any part of it. In this Senſe, the Biſhop of *Eugubium*'s Power extended as far as the Biſhop of *Rome*'s; The Biſhop of *Rhegium* was as much Biſhop of the whole Church, as *Conſtantinople*; and *Tanis* equal to *Alexandria*: For in St. *Jerom*'s [f] Language, they were all *Ejuſdem Meriti*, and *ejuſdem Sacerdotii*; of the ſame Merit, and equal in their Prieſthood, which was but one. In things that did not appertain to the Faith, they were not to meddle with other Men's Dioceſes, but only to mind the Buſineſs of their own: But when the Faith or Welfare of the Church lay at ſtake, and Religion was manifeſtly invaded; then, by this Rule of there being but one Epiſcopacy, every other Biſhoprick was as much their Dioceſe as their own; And no Human Laws or Canons, could tie up their Hands from performing ſuch Acts of their Epiſcopal Office in any part of the World, as they thought neceſſary for the Preſervation of Religion.

Biſhoprick in the Church.

Sect. 3.
Some particular Inſtances of Private Bi-

For the better underſtanding the Churches Practice in this Point, I ſhall illuſtrate it in two

[d] Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. p. 108. [e] Id. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 112. Epiſcopatus unus, Epiſcoporum multorum concordi numeroſitate diffuſus, &c. *In the ſame Epiſtle, he often mentions the* Collegium Sacerdotale. It. Epiſt. 59. & 68.
[f] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr.

Bishops acting as Bishops of the whole Universal Church.

or three particular Instances. It was a Rule in the Primitive Church, That no Bishop should Ordain in another's Diocese, without his Leave: And tho' this was a sort of Confinement of the Episcopal Power to a single Diocese, yet for Order sake it was generally observed. But then it might happen, that in some Cases there might be a Necessity to do otherwise: As in case the Bishop of any Diocese was turned Heretick, and would Ordain none but Heretical Clergy, and persecute and drive away the Orthodox: In that Case, any Catholick Bishop, as being a Bishop of the Universal Church, was authorized to Ordain Orthodox Men in such a Diocese, tho' contrary to the common Rule; because this was evidently for the Preservation of the Faith, which is the Supreme Rule of all; and therefore that other Rule must give way to this Superior Obligation. Upon this account, when the Church was in danger of being over-run with *Arianism*, the great *Athanasius* as he returned from his Exile, made no Scruple to Ordain in several Cities [*g*] as he went along, tho' they were not in his own Diocese. And the famous *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, did the like in the Times of the *Arian* Persecution under *Valens*. *Theodoret* [*b*] says, He went about all *Syria*, *Phœnicia*, and *Palestine*, in a Soldier's Habit; Ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, and setting in Order whatever he found wanting in the Churches. He Ordained Bishops also in *Syria* and *Cilicia*, and other Places; whose Names *Theodoret* [*i*] has recorded. Now all this was contrary to the common Rules, but the Necessities of the Church required it; and That gave them Authority in such a Case to exert

[*g*] Socrat. Lib. 2. c. 24. [*b*] Theod. Lib. 4. c. 13.
[*i*] Theod. Lib. 5. c. 4.

their

their Power, and act as Biſhops of the whole Catholick Church. *Epiphanius* made uſe of the ſame Power and Privilege in a like Caſe; Ordaining *Paulinianus*, St. *Jerom*'s Brother, firſt Deacon, and then Presbyter, in a Monaſtery out of his own Dioceſe in *Paleſtine*; againſt which, when ſome of his Adverſaries objected, that it was done contrary to Canon; he vindicated [*k*] his Practice upon the Strength of this Principle; That in Caſe of preſſing Neceſſity, ſuch as this was, where the Intereſt of God was to be ſerved, every Biſhop had Power to act in any part of the Church: For though all Biſhops had their particular Churches to officiate in, and were not ordinarily to exceed their own Bounds; yet the Love of Chriſt was a Rule above all: And therefore Men were not barely to conſider the thing that was done, but the Circumſtances of the Action, the Time, the Manner, the Perſons for whoſe ſake, and the End for which it is done. Thus *Epiphanius* apologizes for the Exerciſe of his Epiſcopal Power in the Dioceſe of another Man. Now from all this it appears, that every Biſhop was as much an Univerſal Biſhop, and had as much the Care of the whole Church, as the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf; there being no Acts of the Epiſcopal Office, which they could not perform in any part of the World, when need required, without a Diſpenſation, as well as he. All that he enjoyed above others, was only the Rights of a Metropolitan, or a Patriarch, and thoſe confined by the Canons to a

[*k*] Epiphan. Ep. ad Joan. Hieroſol. Ob Dei timorem hoc ſumus facere compulſi: Maximè cum nulla ſit diverſitas in Sacerdotio Dei, & ubi utilitati Dei providetur. Nam etſi ſinguli Eccleſiarum Epiſcopi habent ſub ſe Eccleſias, quibus curam videntur impendere, & nemo ſuper alienam menſuram extenditur; tamen præponitur omnibus Charitas Chriſti, in qua nulla ſimulatio eſt: nec conſiderandum quid factum ſit, ſed quo Tempore, & quo Modo, & in quibus, & quare factum ſit.

cer-

certain District; of which more hereafter in their proper place.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Independency of Biſhops, eſpecially in the Cyprianick *Age, and in the* African *Churches.*

Sect. 1.
What meant by the Independency of Biſhops one of another, and their abſolute Power in their own Church.

THere is one thing more muſt be taken notice of, whilſt we are conſidering the proper Office of Biſhops, which is the Abſolute Power of every Biſhop in his own Church, Independent of all others. For the right underſtanding the juſt Limits of this Power, we are to diſtinguiſh between the Subſtantial and the Ritual Part of Religion. For it was in the latter chiefly that Biſhops had an abſolute Power in their own Church, being at Liberty to uſe what indifferent Rites they thought fit in their own Church, without being accountable for their Practice to any other. In matters of Faith indeed, when they corrupted the Truth by Heretical Doctrines, or introduced any Rituals that were deſtructive of it, there they were obnoxious to the Cenſure of all other Biſhops; and every individual of the whole Catholick College of Biſhops (as has been noted in the laſt Chapter) was authoriſed to oppoſe them: But in ſuch indifferent Rites as were Lawful to be uſed in the Church, every Biſhop was allowed to chuſe for himſelf, and his own Church, ſuch as he thought fit and expedient in his own Wiſdom and Diſcretion.

Sect. 2.
All Biſhops had

Thus for Inſtance, though there was but one form of Worſhip through-

throughout the whole Church, as to what concerned the Subſtance of Chriſtian Worſhip; yet every Biſhop was at Liberty to form his own Liturgy in what Method and Words he thought proper, only keeping to the Analogy of Faith and ſound Doctrine. Thus *Gregory Nazianzen* obſerves of St. *Baſil*, that among other good Services which he did for the Church of *Cæſarea*, whilſt he was but a Presbyter in it, one was [m] the compoſing of Forms of Prayer, which by the Conſent and Authority of his Biſhop *Euſebius* were uſed by the Church. And this is thought not improbably by ſome [n] to be the firſt Draught of that Liturgy, which bears his Name to this Day. The Church of *Neo-Cæſarea* in *Pontus*, where St. *Baſil* was born, had a Liturgy peculiar to themſelves, which St. *Baſil* [o] ſpeaks of in one of his Epiſtles. *Chryſoſtom*'s Liturgy, which he compoſed for the Church of *Conſtantinople*, differed from theſe. The *Ambroſian* Form differed from the *Roman*, and the *Roman* from others. The *Africans* had peculiar Forms of their own, differing from the *Roman*, as appears from ſome Paſſages cited by *Victorinus Afer* and *Fulgentius*, out of the *African* Liturgies, which Cardinal *Bona* [p] owns are not to be found in the *Roman*.

Liberty to form their own Liturgies.

Sect. 3.

And expreſs the ſame Creed in different Forms.

The like Obſervation may be made upon the Creeds uſed in divers Churches. There was but one Rule of *Faith*, as *Tertullian* [q] calls it, and that fixt and unalterable, as to the Subſtance, throughout the whole

[m] Naz. Orat. 20. in Laud. Baſil. p. 340. εὐχῶν διατάξεις, καὶ διακοσμίας τῆς βήματος. [n] Billius Not. in Loc. Cav. Hiſt. Liter. Vol. 1. p. 194. [o] Baſil. Ep. 63. ad Neocæſar. [p] Bona Rer. Liturgic. Lib. 1. c. 7. n. 3. [q] Tertul. de veland. Virg. c. 1. Regula Fidei una omnino eſt, ſola immobilis & irreformabilis, &c.

Church,

Church. Yet there were different ways of expreſſing it, as appears from the ſeveral Forms ſtill extant, which differ ſomething from one another. Thoſe in [r] *Irenæus*, in [s] *Cyprian* and *Tertullian* [t], are not exactly in the ſame Method nor Form of Words. The Creed of *Euſebius* [u] and his Church of *Cæſarea* differed from that of *Jeruſalem*, upon which *Cyril* [w] Comments; And that of *Cyril*'s from that in St. *James*'s [x] Liturgy. And to omit abundance more that might here be mentioned, the Creed of *Aquileia* recited by *Ruffin* [y] differs from the *Roman* Creed, which is that we commonly call the Apoſtles Creed. Now the Reaſon of all this Difference could be no other but this, that all Biſhops had Power to frame the Creeds of their own Churches, and expreſs them in ſuch Terms as ſuited beſt their own Convenience, and to meet with the Hereſies they were moſt in danger from: As *Ruffin* obſerves that the Words *Inviſible* and *Impaſſible*, were added to the firſt Article in the Creed of *Aquileia*, in Oppoſition to the *Patripaſſian* or *Sabellian* Hereticks, who aſſerted that the Father was Viſible and Paſſible in Human Fleſh, as well as the Son. And it is evident the Biſhops of other Churches uſed the ſame Liberty, as they ſaw Occaſion.

Sect. 4.
And appoint particular Days of Faſting in their own Churches.

It were eaſy to confirm this Obſervation by many other Inſtances of the like Nature; but I ſhall only name one more, which is the Power every Biſhop had to appoint particular Days of Faſting in his own Church.

[r] Iren. Lib. 1. c. 2. [s] Cypr. Ep. 70. ad Epiſc. Numid. p. 190. It. Ep. 76. al. 69. ad Magnum. p. 183. ed. Oxon.
[t] Tertul. Ibid. [u] Euſeb. Ep. ad Cæſarienſ. ap. Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 8. [w] Cyril. Hieroſol. Catech. 4.
[x] Liturg. Jacobi. Bibl. Patr Gr. Lat. T. 2. p. 7.
[y] Ruffin. in Symbol. Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Inviſibilem & Impaſſibilem.

This

This we learn from St. *Auſtin*'s Anſwer to *Caſulanus* about the *Saturday* Faſt. *Caſulanus* was very much troubled and perplexed about it, becauſe he obſerved in *Africk* ſome Churches keep it a Faſt, and others a Feſtival; nay ſometimes in the ſame Church Men were divided in their Practice, and one part dined on that Day, whilſt another faſted. Now to remove *Caſulanus* his Scruple, St. *Auſtin* gives him [z] this Anſwer: That the beſt way in this Caſe was to follow thoſe, who were the Rulers of every Church. Therefore if he would take his Advice, he ſhould never reſiſt his Biſhop in this Matter, but do as he did without Doubt or Scruple. Which plainly implies, That it was then in every Biſhop's Power to Order or not Order this Faſt in his own Church, as he ſaw moſt convenient.

Sect. 5. *The Independency of Biſhops moſt conſpicuous in the* African *Churches.*

And indeed theſe Privileges of Biſhops, and their Abſolute and Independent Power in all ſuch Matters, were no where more fully reſerved to them, than in the *African* Churches, from the time of *Cyprian*, who frequently makes mention of this Independent Power; which extended not only to mere Rituals, but to ſeveral momentous Points of Diſcipline; ſuch as the Caſe of Rebaptizing Hereticks, admitting Adulterers to the Communion of the Church again, and the Queſtion about the Validity of *Clinick* Baptiſm. In theſe Points *Cyprian*'s Opinion and Practice differed from others of his Fellow-Biſhops: But yet he aſſumed no Power of Cenſuring thoſe that acted differently from what he

[z] Aug. Ep. 86. ad Caſulan. Mos eorum mihi ſequendus videtur, quibus eorum Populorum Congregatio regenda commiſſa eſt. Quapropter ſi conſilio meo acquieſcis: Epiſcopo tuo in hac re noli reſiſtere, & quod facit ipſe, ſine ullo ſcrupulo vel diſceptatione Sectare.

did,

did, nor ſeparated from their Communion upon it; but left every one to give an Account of his own Practice to God the Judge of all. For the Caſe of Re-baptizing ſuch as were Baptized by Hereticks, he was entirely for it, as is ſufficiently known to all: But he was not ſo Zealous for it, as to exerciſe any Judicial Power of Depoſing or Excommunicating thoſe who practiſed otherwiſe; but declares he left every Biſhop to his Liberty, to act according to his Judgment, and anſwer for what he did to God alone. To this purpoſe he expreſſes himſelf in his Letter to Pope [*a*] *Stephen*, and that to [*b*] *Jubaianus*, but moſt fully in his Speech delivered at the opening of the great Council of *Carthage*, which met to conſider this very Queſtion. Let us every one now, ſays he, give our Opinion of this Matter; [*bb*] Judging no Man, nor Repelling any from our Communion, that ſhall think otherwiſe. For no one of us makes himſelf Biſhop of Biſhops, or compels his Collegues by Tyrannical Terror to a Neceſſity of Complying; foraſmuch as every Biſhop, according to the Liberty and Power that is granted him, is free to act as he ſees fit; and can no more be judged by others,

[*a*] Cypr. Ep. 72. ad. Steph. p. 197. Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut Legem damus, cum habeat in Eccleſiæ adminiſtratione voluntatis ſuæ arbitrium liberum unuſquiſq; Præpoſitus, rationem actus ſui Domino redditurus. [*b*] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 210. [*bb*] Con. Carth. ap. Cypr. p. 229. Supereſt ut de hac ipſa re ſinguli quid ſentiamus, proferamus; neminem judicantes, aut à jure Communionis aliquem, ſi diverſum ſenſerit, amoventes. Neque enim quiſquam noſtrum Epiſcopum ſe Epiſcoporum conſtituit, aut Tyrannico terrore ad obſequendi neceſſitatem Collegas ſuos adigit; quando habeat omnis Epiſcopus pro licentia Libertatis & Poteſtatis ſuæ, arbitrium proprium; tamque judicari ab alio non poſſit, quam nec ipſe poteſt judicare. Sed exſpectemus uuiverſi Judicium Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, qui unus & ſolus habet poteſtatem & præponendi nos in Eccleſiæ ſuæ Gubernatione, & de actu noſtro judicandi.

than

than he can judge them. But let us all expect the Judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only hath Power both to invest us with the Government of his Church, and to pass Sentence upon our Actions. Thus far *Cyprian* in full and open Council declares for the Independent Power of every Bishop, tacitly reflecting upon the Bishop of *Rome*, who pretended to excommunicate those who differed in Opinion and Practice from him, which *Cyprian* condemns as a Tyrannical way of proceeding.

For the next Point, that is, the Case of admitting Adulterers to Communion again, *Cyprian* says his Predecessors in *Africk* were divided upon the Question; but they did not divide Communion upon it: For though some Bishops admitted Adulterers to Penance, and others refused to do it, yet they did not Censure each others Practice, but preserved Peace and Concord among [*c*] themselves, leaving every one to answer to God for his Actions. I know indeed some Learned Persons [*d*] interpret this Liberty of the *African* Bishops so, as to make it mean no more than a Liberty to follow their own Judgment, till such times as the Church should determine the Matter in Dispute, by making some publick Decree about it: But I must own, I cannot but think *Cyprian* meant something more, because he pleads for the same Liberty even after the Decrees of a Plenary Council; as we have seen in his Preface to the Council of *Carthage*.

As to the Third Question about the Validity of *Clinick* Baptism, that is, whether Persons who were only sprinkled with Water in their Beds in time of Sickness, and not immersed or washed all over the Body in Baptism, were to be looked upon as Compleat Christians; *Cyprian* for his own part resolves it

[*c*] Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 110. [*d*] *Bishop* Fell, Not. in Loc. citat.

in

in the Affirmative: But yet, if any Biſhops were otherwiſe perſuaded, that it was not Lawful Baptiſm, and upon that ground gave ſuch Perſons a new Immerſion, he profeſſes [e] that he preſcribes to none, but leaves every one to act according to his own Judgment and Diſcretion. This was that Ancient Liberty of the *Cyprianick* Age, of which I have diſcourſed a little more particularly in this place, becauſe it ſhews us what was then the unconteſted Power and Privilege of every Biſhop in the *African* Church, which is not ſo commonly underſtood in theſe latter Ages.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Power of Biſhops in Hearing and Determining Secular Cauſes.

Sect. 1.

Biſhops commonly choſen Arbitrators of Mens Differences in the Primitive Church.

WE have hitherto conſidered ſuch Offices of the Epiſcopal Function, as belonged to all Biſhops by the Laws of God and the Canons of the Church: Beſides theſe there was one Office more, impoſed upon them by Cuſtom, and the Laws of the State; which was the Hearing and Determining Secular Cauſes, upon the continual Applications and Addreſſes that People made to them. For ſuch was the ſingular Character and Repute of Biſhops, and ſuch the entire Confidence Men generally repo-

[e] Cypr. Ep. 76. al. 69. ad Magnum. p. 186. Qua in parte nemini verecundia & modeſtia noſtra præjudicat, quo minus unuſquiſque quod putat, ſentiat, & quod ſenſerit, faciat. It. p. 188. Nemini præſcribentes, quo minus ſtatuat quod putat unuſquiſque præpoſitus; actus ſui rationem Domino redditurus.

ſed

ſed in them for their Integrity and Juſtice, that they were commonly appealed to, as the beſt Arbitrators of Men's Differences, and the moſt Impartial Judges of the common Diſputes that happened among them. *Sidonius Apollinaris* [*f*] often refers to this Cuſtom: And *Syneſius* calls it [*g*] part of his own Epiſcopal Office and Function. St. *Ambroſe* teſtifies for himſelf [*h*] that he was uſed to be appealed to upon ſuch Occaſions; and St. *Auſtin* [*i*] ſays of him, that he was often ſo much employed in hearing Cauſes, that he had ſcarce time for other Buſineſs. And this was St. *Auſtin*'s Caſe alſo, who frequently complains of the Burden [*k*] that lay upon him in this reſpect. For not only *Chriſtians*, but Men of all Sects applied to him: Inſomuch that as *Poſſidius* [*l*] notes in his Life, he often ſpent all the Morning, and ſometimes the whole Day Faſting and Hearing their Cauſes; which though it was a great Fatigue to him, yet he was willing to bear it, becauſe it gave him frequent Opportunities of inſtilling the Principles of Truth and Virtue into the Minds of the Parties that applied themſelves to him.

Sect. 2. *The Original of this Cuſtom. What meant by the Word* ἐξουθενημένους *in St.* Paul, 1 Cor. 6. 4.

And it is to be obſerved, that though there be no expreſs Text in the New Teſtament, that commands Biſhops to be Judges in Secular Cauſes, yet St. *Auſtin* was of Opinion, that St. *Paul* in prohibiting Men to go to Law before the Unbelievers, did virtually lay this Obligation upon them. For he ſays once and again [*m*] that it was the Apoſtle

[*f*] Sidon. Lib. 3. Ep. 12. Lib. 6. Ep. 2, & 4. [*g*] Syneſ. Ep. 105. p 399. [*h*] Ambroſ. Ep. 24. ad Marcellum.

[*i*] Aug. Confeſſ. Lib. 6. c. 3. [*k*] Aug. Ep. 110. & 147. It. de Opere Monach. c. 29. [*l*] Poſſid. Vit. Aug. c. 19.

[*m*] Aug. Ser. 24. in Pſal. 118. Conſtituit talibus Cauſis Eccleſiaſticos Apoſtolus Cognitores, in Foro prohibens jurgare Chriſtianos. Id. de Oper. Monach. c. 29. Quibus nos moleſtiis affixit Apoſtolus, &c.

that inſtituted Eccleſiaſtical Judges, and laid the Burden of Secular Cauſes upon them. By which he means, that the Apoſtle gave a general Direction to Chriſtians to chuſe Arbitrators among themſelves; and that Cuſtom determined this Office particularly to the Biſhops, as the beſt qualified by their Wiſdom and Probity to diſcharge it. And this is very agreeable to St. *Paul*'s meaning, 1 *Cor.* 6. 4. as ſome very Learned and Judicious Criticks [*n*] underſtand him. For though all the common Tranſlations render the Words, Ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, Perſons that are leaſt Eſteemed in the Church: Yet Dr. *Lightfoot* obſerves, that they may as well ſignify Perſons of the greateſt Eſteem. For the Original Word, Ἐξουθενημένοι, ſignifies only private Judges, or Arbitrators of Men's own chuſing, ſuch as were in uſe among the *Jews*, who called them ἰδιῶται, & *non-Authentici*, not becauſe they were of the Meaneſt and moſt Contemptible of the People, but becauſe they were the loweſt Rank of Judges, and not ſettled as a ſtanding Court by the *Sanhedrim*, but choſen by the Litigants themſelves to arbitrate their Cauſes. Such Private Judges the Apoſtle directs the Chriſtians to chuſe in the Church, and refer their Controverſies to them: Which is not any Injunction to chuſe Judges out of the pooreſt and meaneſt, and moſt ignorant of the People, but rather the contrary, Perſons that were well qualified by their Wiſdom and Authority, to take upon them to be Judges, and end Controverſies among their Brethren. Now becauſe none were thought better qualified in theſe Reſpects than Biſhops, the Office of Judging upon that account was commonly impoſed upon them, and they in Decency and Charity could not well refuſe it. This ſeems to be the true Original of this part of the Epiſcopal Office and Function.

[*n*] Lightfoot. & Lud. de Dieu in 1 Cor. 6. 4.

But

Sect. 3.
This Power of Biſhops confirmed by the Imperial Laws.

But what was thus begun by Cuſtom, while the Civil Governors were Heathens, was afterward confirmed and eſtabliſhed by Law, when the Emperors became Chriſtians. *Euſebius* [o] ſays, *Conſtantine* made a Law to confirm all ſuch Deciſions of Biſhops in their Conſiſtories, and that no Secular Judges ſhould have any Power to reverſe or diſannul them; Foraſmuch as the Prieſts of God were to be preferred before any other Judge. And *Sozomen* [p] adds, that he gave leave to all Litigants to refer their Cauſes to the Determination of Biſhops, whoſe Sentence ſhould ſtand good, and be as Authentick as if it had been the Deciſion of the Emperor himſelf: And that the Governors of every Province and their Officers ſhould be obliged to put their Decrees in Execution. There is a Law now added at the end of the *Theodſian Code*, which ſome take for this very Law of *Conſtantine* mentioned by theſe Authors. *Selden* himſelf reckons [q] it a genuine Piece; but I think *Gothofred's* Arguments are ſtronger to prove it ſpurious. For it grants Biſhops ſuch a Power, as neither *Euſebius* nor *Sozomen* mention, and all other Laws contradict: *Viz.* That if either of the contending Parties, the Poſſeſſor [r] or the Plaintiff, was minded to bring the Cauſe before a Biſhop, either when it was before a Secular Court, or when it was determined, he

[o] Euſeb. de vit. Conſtant. Lib. 4. c. 27. [p] Sozom. Lib. 1. c. 9. [q] Selden Uxor. Hebr. Lib. 3. c. 28. p 564.

[r] Extravag. de Elect. Judicii Epiſcop. ad Calcem Cod. Theod. T. 4. p. 303. Quicunque Litem habens, ſive Poſſeſſor, ſive Petitor erit, inter initia Litis, vel decurſis temporum curriculis, ſive cum negotium peroratur, ſive cum jam cœperit promi ſententia, Judicium eligit ſacroſanctæ Legis Antiſtitis, ilico ſine aliqua dubitatione, etiamſi alia Pars refragatur, ad Epiſcopum cum ſermone Litigantium dirigatur. Vid. Gothofred. Comment. in Loc.

might do it, though the other Party was againſt it. Whereas all Laws and Hiſtory are againſt this Practice: For no Cauſe was to be brought before a Biſhop, except both Parties agreed by way of Compromiſe to take him for their Arbitrator. In this Caſe the Biſhop's Sentence was Valid, and to be executed by the Secular Power, but not otherwiſe. So that either this was not the Genuine Law of *Conſtantine*, to which *Euſebius* and *Sozomen* refer, or elſe it was revoked and contradicted by all others. *Gothofred* produces a great many contrary Laws: I ſhall content my ſelf with a ſingle Inſtance.

Sect. 4. *Yet not allowed in Criminal Cauſes; nor in any Cauſes, but when the Litigants both agreed to take them for Arbitrators.*

In the *Juſtinian Code* [s] we have Two Laws of the Emperors *Arcadius* and *Honorius* about the ſame Matter, which may ſerve to explain the Law of *Conſtantine*. For there any Biſhops are allowed to judge, and their Judgment is ordered to be Final, ſo as no Appeal ſhould be made from it; and the Officers of the Secular Judges are appointed to execute the Biſhops Sentence: But then there are theſe Two Limitations expreſly put in: 1ſt, That they ſhall only have Power to judge, when both Parties agree by Conſent to refer their Cauſes to their Arbitration. And, 2dly, where the Cauſes are purely Civil, and not Criminal Cauſes, where perhaps Life and Death might be concerned. For in ſuch Cauſes the Clergy were prohibited by the Canons [t] of

[s] Cod. Juſtin. Lib. 1. Tit. 4. Leg. 7. Si qui ex Conſenſu apud Sacræ Legis Antiſtitem litigare voluerint, non vetabuntur. Sed experientur illius in Civili duntaxat negotio, more Arbitri ſponte reſidentis Judicium.. Ibid. Leg. 8. Epiſcopale Judicium ratum ſit omnibus, qui ſe audiri à Sacerdotibus elegerint; eamque eorum Judicationi adhibendam eſſe reverentiam jubemus, quam veſtris deferri neceſſe eſt Poteſtatibus, à quibus non licet provocare, &c. [t] Concil. Tarracon. can. 4. Habeant Licentiam Judicandi, exceptis Criminalibus Negotiis.

the

the Church, as well as the Laws of the State, from being concerned as Judges. Therefore Biſhops never ſuffered any Criminal Cauſes to come before them, except ſuch as were to be puniſhed with Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures.

Sect. 5. *Biſhops ſometimes made their Presbyters, and ſometimes Laymen their Subſtitutes in this Affair.*

But they had commonly Civil Cauſes more than enough flowing in upon them. So that they were forced ſometimes to let part of this Care devolve upon ſome other Perſon, whoſe Integrity and Prudence they could confide in. This was commonly one of their Clergy, a Presbyter or a Principal Deacon. St. *Auſtin*, when he found the Burden of this Affair begin to preſs too hard upon him, ſubſtituted *Eradius* his Presbyter [*u*] in his room. And the Council of *Taragone* ſpeaks not only of Presbyters but [*w*] Deacons alſo, who were deputed to hear Secular Cauſes. And *Socrates* ſays, [*x*] *Sylvanus* Biſhop of *Troas* took the Power wholly out of the Hands of his Clergy, becauſe he had found ſome of them faulty in making an unlawful Gain of the Cauſes that were brought before them; for which Reaſon he never deputed any one of them to be Judge, but made ſome Layman his Delegate, whom he knew to be a Man of Integrity, and ſtrict Lover of Juſtice. I leave the Learned to enquire, whether Lay-Chancellors in the Church had not their firſt Riſe and Original from ſome ſuch Occaſion as this, whilſt Biſhops deputed Laymen to hear Secular Cauſes in their Name, ſtill reſerving the proper Spiritual and Eccleſiaſtical Power entirely to themſelves.

[*u*] Aug. Ep. 110. [*w*] Con. Tarracon. c. 4. Nullus Epiſcoporum, Presbyterorum, vel Clericorum, Die Dominico propoſitum cujuſcunq; cauſæ negotium audeat judicare.

[*x*] Socrat. Lib. 7. c. 37.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Privilege of Biſhops to intercede for Criminals.

Sect. 1. *Of the great Power and Intereſt of Biſhops in Interceding to the Secular Magiſtrates.*

I Have obſerved in the foregoing Chapter, that Biſhops were never allowed to be Judges in Capital or Criminal Cauſes, becauſe they were not to be concerned in Blood: They were to be ſo far from having any thing to do in the Death of any Man, that Cuſtom made it almoſt a piece of their Office and Duty to ſave Men from Death, by Interceding to the Secular Magiſtrates for Criminals that were condemned to die. St. *Ambroſe* often made uſe of this Privilege, as the Author of his Life obſerves; frequently addreſſing himſelf to [*y*] *Macedonius*, and *Stilico* [*z*], and other great Miniſters of the Age, in behalf of poor Delinquents, to obtain Pardon for them. St. *Auſtin* did the ſame for the *Circumcellions*, when they were convicted and condemned for Murdering ſome of the Catholick Clergy: He wrote two Pathetick Letters [*a*] to the *African* Magiſtrates, *Marcellinus Comes*, and *Apringius*, deſiring that their Lives might be ſpared, and that they might only be puniſhed with cloſe Cuſtody and Confinement, where they might be ſet to Work, and have time allowed them for Repentance. The Council [*b*] of *Sardica* ſeems to ſpeak of it as the Duty of all Biſhops to intercede for ſuch as implored the Mercy of the Church, when they were Condemned to be Tranſported or Baniſhed, or any the like Pu-

[*y*] Paulin. vit. Ambroſ. p. 8. [*z*] Ibid. p. 12.
[*a*] Aug. Ep. 159, & 160. [*b*] Con. Sardic. Can. 7.

niſhment,

niſhment. And the Cuſtom was become ſo general, that it began to be conſidered as a Condition in the Election of a Biſhop, whether he were qualified to diſcharge this part of his Office as well as others. *Sidonius Apollinaris* [c] inſtances in ſuch a Caſe, where it was made an Objection by the People againſt the Election of a certain Biſhop, that being a Man of a Monkiſh and retired Life, he was fitter to be an Abbot than a Biſhop: He might intercede, they ſaid, indeed with the heavenly Judge for their Souls, but he was not qualified to intercede with the earthly Judges for their Bodies. He was not a Man of Addreſs, which they then thought neceſſary to diſcharge this part of the Office of a Biſhop. They might perhaps judge wrong, as thoſe in St. *Jerom* [d] did, who pretended that Clergymen ought to give ſplendid Entertainments to the Secular Judges, that they might gain an Intereſt in them; whom St. *Jerom* juſtly reproves, telling them, that any Judge would pay a greater Reverence to a Pious and Sober Clergyman, than to a Wealthy one, and would reſpect him more for his Holineſs than his Riches. However, this ſhews what was then the common Cuſtom, and how great an Intereſt Biſhops generally had in the Secular Magiſtrate, who ſeldom rejected any Petitions of this Nature. *Socrates* notes, that even ſome of the *Novatian* Biſhops enjoyed this Privilege, as *Paulus* [e] of *Conſtantinople*, and *Leontius* [f] of *Rome*, at whoſe Interceſſion *Theodoſius* the Emperor pardoned *Symmachus*, who had been guilty of

[c] Sidon. Lib. 7. Ep. 9. p. 443. Hic qui nominatur, inquiunt, non Epiſcopi, ſed potius Abbatis complet officium: Et intercedere magis pro Animabus apud Cœleſtem, quam pro Corporibus apud Terrenum Judicem poteſt. [d] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. p. 15. Quod ſi obtenderis te facere hæc, ut roges pro miſeris atque ſubjectis: Judex Seculi plus deferet Clerico Continenti, quam Diviti, & magis ſanctitatem tuam venerabitur quam opes. [e] Socrat. Lib. 7. c. 17. [f] Id. lib. 5. cap. 14.

Treaſon, in making a Panegyrick upon *Maximus* the Tyrant, but was after his Death fled for Sanctuary to a Chriſtian Church.

Sect. 2. *The Reaſons why Biſhops interceded for ſome Criminals, and not others.*

We may here obſerve that Crimes in themſelves of a very heinous Nature, ſuch as Treaſon and Murder, were ſometimes pardoned at their Requeſt: But we are not to imagine that Biſhops at any time turned Patrons for Criminals, to the Obſtruction of Publick Juſtice (which would have been to have cut the Sinews of Government) but only in ſuch Caſes, where Pardon would manifeſtly be for the Benefit and Honour both of the Church and Commonwealth; or elſe where the Crimes themſelves had ſome ſuch alleviating Circumſtances, as might incline a compaſſionate Judge to grant a Pardon. As when St. *Ambroſe* interceded with *Stilico* for the Pardon of ſome poor deluded Wretches, whom *Stilico*'s own Servant by Forgery had drawn into an Error: Their Ignorance might reaſonably be pleaded in their behalf. And when St. *Auſtin* petitioned for Favour to be ſhewed to the *Circumcellions*, it was, he thought, for the Honour of the Church, to free her from the Suſpicion and Charge of Revenge and Cruelty, which the *Donatiſts* were ſo ready to caſt upon her. And therefore he deſired *Apringius* [g] the Proconſul, to ſpare them for the ſake of Chriſt and his Church, as well as to give them time to ſee their Error, and repent of it.

Sect. 3. *They never interceded in Civil Mat-*

It muſt farther be noted from St. *Ambroſe*, that Biſhops, though they themſelves were ſometimes

[g] Aug. Ep. 160. Illi impio ferro fuderunt Sanguinem Chriſtianum: Tu ab eorum Sanguine etiam Juridicum gladium cohibe propter Chriſtum ——— Tu inimicis Eccleſiæ viventibus relaxa ſpatium pœnitendi.

choſen

choſen Judges in Civil Cauſes, yet never interceded for any Man in ſuch Cauſes to the Secular Judges. And he gives a very good Reaſon [*b*] for it: Becauſe, in pecuniary Cauſes, where Two Parties are concern'd, a Biſhop could not intercede for one Party, but the other would be injured, and have Reaſon to think he loſt his Cauſe by the Intereſt and Favour of the Interceſſor inclining to the adverſe Party. For which Reaſon, there are no Examples of their Interceding in ſuch Caſes.

ters, and Pecuniary Caſes.

CHAP. IX.

Of ſome particular Honours and Inſtances of Reſpect ſhewed to Biſhops by all Perſons in general.

THere are ſeveral other Privileges belonging to Biſhops, in common with the reſt of the Clergy; ſuch as their Exemption from Burdenſome Offices, and ſome ſort of Taxes, and the Cognizance of the Secular Courts in ſome Caſes; of which I ſhall ſay nothing particularly here, becauſe they will be conſider'd when we treat of the Privileges of the Clergy in general. But there are two or three Cuſtoms, which argued a particular Reſpect paid to Biſhops, and therefore I muſt not here wholly paſs them over. One of theſe was the ancient Cuſtom of Bowing the Head before them, to receive their Bleſſing: A Cuſtom ſo univerſally

Sect. 1. *Of the ancient Cuſtom of Bowing the Head, to receive the Benediction of Biſhops.*

[*b*] Ambroſ. de Offic. Lib. 3. c. 9. In Cauſis Pecuniariis intervenire non eſt Sacerdotis, &c.

pre-

prevailing, that the Emperors themſelves did not refuſe to comply with it: As may appear from that Diſcourſe of *Hilary* [*i*] to *Conſtantius*; where he tells him, He entertained the Biſhop with a Kiſs, with which Chriſt was betrayed; and bowed his Head to receive their Benediction, whilſt he trampled on their Faith. This plainly refers to the Cuſtom we are ſpeaking of. And by it we may underſtand the meaning of *Theodoret*, when he ſays [*k*], The Emperor *Valentinian* gave Orders to the Biſhops, who were met to make choice of a Biſhop of *Milan*; That they ſhould place ſuch an one on the Biſhop's Throne, of that Eminency for Life and Doctrine, that the Emperors themſelves might not be aſhamed to bow their Heads to him. The ſame Cuſtom is more plainly hinted at by St. *Chryſoſtom*, in one of his Homilies [*l*] to the People of *Antioch*; where ſpeaking of *Flavian* their Biſhop, who was gone to the Emperor to procure a Pardon for them; he ſays, *Flavian* was a Prince, and a more Honourable Prince than the other: Foraſmuch as the Sacred Laws made the Emperor ſubmit his Head to the Hands of the Biſhop. He ſpeaks of no other Submiſſion, but only this, in receiving the Biſhop's Benediction. For in other reſpects, the Prieſts in thoſe Days were always ſubject to the Emperors. He that would ſee more Proofs of this Cuſtom, may conſult *Valeſius*, who [*m*] has collected a great many Paſſages out of other Authors relating to it. I ſhall only add here that Reſcript of *Honorius* and *Valentinian*, which ſays, Biſhops were the Perſons to whom all the World bowed the Head; *Quibus omnis terra caput inclinat.*

[*i*] Hilar. adv. Conſtant. p. 95. Oſculo Sacerdotes excipis, quo & Chriſtus eſt proditus: Caput Benedictioni ſummittis, ut Fidem calces. [*k*] Theod Lib. 4. c. 6. ὅπως αὐτῷ τὰς ἡμετέρας ὑποκλίνωσι κεφαλάς. [*l*] Chryſ. Hom. 3. ad Pop. Antioch. T. 1. p. 48. [*m*] Valeſ. Not. in Theod. Lib. 4. c. 6.

Such

Such another Cuſtomary Reſpect was paid them, by Kiſſing their Hand; which ſeems to have accompany'd the former Ceremony: For St. *Ambroſe* [n] joins them both together, ſaying, That Kings and Princes did not diſdain to bend and bow their Necks to the Knees of the Prieſts, and kiſs their Hands; thinking themſelves protected by their Prayers. *Paulinus* ſays [o], The People paid this Reſpect commonly to St. *Ambroſe*. And *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaking of *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, ſays [p], At his firſt coming to the City, the whole Multitude went out to meet him, and as many as could come near him, laid hold on his Feet, and kiſſed his Hands. They that pleaſe to ſee more of this Cuſtom, may conſult *Sidonius* [q] *Apollinaris*, and *Savaro*'s Learned Notes [r] upon him; who cites *Ennodius*, and ſeveral other Authors to the ſame purpoſe.

Sect. 2. *Of Kiſſing their Hand.*

St. *Jerom* mentions another Cuſtom, which he condemns as [s] doing too great an Honour to mere Mortal Men; which was, The People's Singing *Hoſanna*'s to their Biſhops, as the Multitude did to our Saviour at his Entrance into *Jeruſalem*. *Valeſius* [t] cites a Paſſage out of *Antoninus*'s Itinerary to the ſame purpoſe; where the Form of Words is, *Bleſſed*

Sect. 3. *The Cuſtoms of Singing* Hoſanna's *to them ſometimes uſed, but not approved.*

[n] Ambroſ. de Dignit. Sacerd. c. 2. Quippe cum videas Regum colla & Principum ſubmitti gentibus Sacerdotum, & exoſculatis eorum dexteris, Orationibus eorum credant ſe communiri. [o] Paulin. Vit. Ambroſ. p. 2, & 3. [p] Chryſ. Hom. 45. in Melet. T. 1. p. 593. [q] Sidon. Lib. 8. Ep. 11. Sancti Gallicini manu oſculata. Id. Lib. 7. Ep. 11.

[r] Savaro Not. in Sidon. Lib. 8. Epiſt. 11. p. 532.

[s] Hieron. in Mat. 21. T. 9. p. 62. Videant ergo Epiſcopi, & quantumlibet Sancti homines, cum quanto periculo dici iſta ſibi patiantur, &c. [t] Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. Lib. 2. c. 23.

he

be ye of the Lord, and bleſſed be your Coming; Hoſanna *in the Higheſt*. Some alſo underſtand *Hegeſippus* [*u*] in the ſame Senſe; where ſpeaking of the Preaching of *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, he ſays, The People that were converted by his Diſcourſe, cried out, *Hoſanna to the Son of David*. *Scaliger* underſtands this as ſpoken to *James* himſelf: But others [*w*] take it for a Doxology, or Acclamation to Chriſt, whom they glorify'd upon the Teſtimony that *James* had given him: And this ſeems to be the truer Senſe of that place; however, in the other Acceptation there is nothing contrary to Cuſtom in it, as appears from what has been ſaid. I do not inſiſt upon what St. *Jerom* in another place ſays [*x*] farther of this Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; That he was a Man of ſuch celebrated Fame among the People, for his great Sanctity, that they ambitiouſly ſtrove to touch the Hem of his Garment: For this Honour was not paid him as a Biſhop, but as a moſt Holy Man; who was indeed, according to the Character given him by *Hegeſippus* and *Epiphanius*, a Man of ſingular Abſtinence and Piety, and one of the Miracles of the Age he lived in. So that this was a ſingular Honour done to him, for his ſingular Holineſs and Virtue.

Sect. 4.
What meant by the Corona Sacerdotalis, *and the Form of Saluting Biſhops* per Coronam.

But to proceed with the common Honours paid to Biſhops. Another Inſtance of Reſpect, may be obſerved in the uſual Forms of Addreſſing them: For when Men ſpake to them, they commonly

[*u*] Hegeſip. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 2 c. 23. Πολλῶν δοξαζόντων ἐπὶ τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τὸ Ιακώβου, καὶ λεγόντων, ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ.

[*w*] Grabe Spicileg. Sæc. 2. p. 207. *tranſlates it thus*: Multi hoc Jacobi Teſtimonio confirmati glorificabant (Jeſum) dicentes, Hoſanna Filio David. [*x*] Hieron. Com. in Gal. 1. Jacobus Epiſcopus Hieroſolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Juſtus; Vir tantæ ſanctitatis & rumoris in populo, ut Fimbriam veſtimenti ejus certatim cuperent attingere.

pre-

prefaced their Diſcourſe with ſome Title of Honour, ſuch as that of *Precor Coronam*, and *Per Coronam veſtram*; which we may *Engliſh*, Your Honour and Dignity; literally, Your Crown. This Form often occurrs in *Sidonius Apollinaris*, *Ennodius*, St. *Jerom* [*y*] and others. St. *Auſtin* ſays, Both the Catholicks [*z*] and *Donatiſts* uſed it, when they ſpake to the Biſhops of either Party; giving them very reſpectful Titles, and intreating, or rather adjuring them *Per Coronam*, that they would hear and determine their Secular Cauſes.

Sect. 5. *Whether Biſhops anciently wore a Mitre, or any the like Ornament.*

The Uſe of this Form of Speech then is plain, but the Reaſon of it is not ſo evident. *Savaro* [*a*] and ſome others fancy it reſpected the Ancient Figure of the Clerical Tonſure; by which the Hair was cut into a Round from the Crown of the Head downwards. Others think it came ſtom the Ornament which Biſhops wore upon their Head; and that they will needs have to be a Crown or Mitre. Whereas, it does not appear that Biſhops had any ſuch Ornament in thoſe Days. I know indeed, both *Valeſius* [*b*] and *Petavius* [*c*] are very confident, that all Biſhops (from the very firſt) had an appendant Badge of Honour in their Foreheads, which they ſay was the ſame with the *Petalum*, or Golden Plate,

[*y*] Sidon. Lib. 6. Ep. 3. Auctoritas Coronæ tuæ, *&c.* Id. Lib. 7. Ep. 8. ad Euphron. De minimis rebus Coronam tuam maximiſq; conſulerem. Ennod. Lib. 4. Ep. 29. ad Symmac. Lib. 5. Ep. 17. ad Marcellinum. Lib. 9. Ep. 27. ad Aurelian. Hieron. Epiſt. 26. ad Auguſt. inter Ep. Aug. Precor Coronam tuam.

[*z*] Aug. Ep. 147. ad Proculeian. Epiſc. partis Donati. Honorant nos veſtri, honorant vos noſtri. Per Coronam noſtram nos adjurant veſtri; per Coronam veſtram vos adjurant noſtri.

[*a*] Savaro Not. in Sidon. Lib. 6. Ep. 3. Baron. an. 58. n. 134. [*b*] Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 24. [*c*] Petav. Not. in Epiph. Hær. 78. n. 14.

which

which the *Jewiſh* High-Prieſts wore: And it cannot be denied, but that as ancient an Author as *Polycrates* [*d*], mentioned both by *Euſebius* and St. *Jerom*, ſays, That St. *John* was a Prieſt, wearing a *Petalum*: And *Epiphanius* [*e*] ſays the ſame of *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. But this was not ſpoken of them as Chriſtian Biſhops, but on Preſumption of their having been *Jewiſh* Prieſts, and of the Family of *Aaron*. *Valeſius* himſelf cites a *MS.* Paſſion of St. *Mark*, which ſets the ſame Ornament on his Head, and gives this very Reaſon for it: It is reported, ſays he, that St. *Mark*, according to the Rites of the Carnal Sacrifice, wore the Chief Prieſt's *Petalum* among the *Jews*: which gives us plainly to [*f*] underſtand, ſays that Author, that he was one of the Tribe of *Levi*, and of the Family of *Aaron*. So he did not take this for the Ornament of a Chriſtian Biſhop, but a *Jewiſh* Prieſt; and that opens the way for us to underſtand what the other Authors meant by it, however *Valeſius* chanced not to obſerve it. Now if it cannot be proved, that Biſhops anciently wore any ſuch Ornament as this, it will much leſs follow that they wore a Royal Crown, or Mitre, as *Spondanus* [*g*] aſſerts they did, and thence deduces the Cuſtom of Addreſſing them *Per Coronam*; therein deſerting his great Maſter *Baronius*, who aſſigns another Reaſon for it. After all, it ſeems moſt probable, that it was no more than a Metaphorical Expreſſion, uſed to denote the Honour and Dignity of the Epiſcopal Order: Tho' I do not deny that the

[*d*] Polycrat. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 24.

[*e*] Epiphan. Hær. 29. n. 2. It. Hær. 78. n. 14.

[*f*] Auctor MS. Paſſion. S. Marc. ap. Valeſ. ibid. B. Marcum juxta ritum carnalis Sacrificii, Pontificalis apicis Petalum in populo geſtaſſe Judæorum, illuſtrium virorum Syngraphæ declarant: Ex quo manifeſtè datur intelligi, de ſtirpe eum Levitica, imo Pontificis Aaron ſacræ Succeſſionis Originem habuiſſe.

[*g*] Spondan. Epitom. Baron. an. 58. n. 54.

Cler-

Clerical Tonſure was ſometimes called *Corona*; but that was not peculiar to Biſhops, but common to all the Clergy.

Sect. 6. *Of the Titles* Ἁγιώτατοι, Sanctiſſimi, *&c.*

It will not be improper to add, while we are upon this Point, that it was uſual in Men's Addreſſes to Biſhops, or in ſpeaking of them, to mention their Names with ſome Additional Titles of Reſpect, ſuch as Θεοφιλέστατοι, and Ἁγιώτατοι, moſt Dear to God, and moſt Holy Fathers: Which Titles occur frequently in the Emperor's Reſcripts in the Civil [*b*] Law, and were of ſuch common Uſe in thoſe Times, that *Socrates* (when he comes to the Sixth Book of his Hiſtory, which treats of his own Times) thinks himſelf obliged to make ſome Apology [*i*] for not giving the Biſhops that were then living theſe Titles. Which I the rather note, becauſe of the Vanity of ſome, who reckon the Title, Moſt Holy Father, the Pope's ſole prerogative; and to correct the Malice of others, who will not allow a Proteſtant Biſhop to receive that Title, without the Suſpicion and Imputation of Popery. As if St. *Auſtin* and St. *Jerom* had been to blame, becauſe the one wrote, and the other received Epiſtles always thus inſcribed; *Domino vere Sancto, & Beatiſſimo Papæ Auguſtino.* See St. *Auſtin*'s Epiſt. 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21. where St. *Jerom* and others give him thoſe honourable Titles.

Sect. 7. *Biſhops diſtinguiſhed by their Throne in the Church.*

There is one thing more that muſt not be omitted, becauſe it was the common Honour and Privilege of all Biſhops, to be diſtinguiſhed in the Church by a Chair, or Seat, which was commonly called their Throne. Thus [*k*] *Euſebius* calls the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*'s

[*b*] Juſtin. Novel. 8, 40, 42, 67, 86, *&c.* Concil. Chalced. Act. 10. [*i*] Socrat. Proœm. ad Lib. 6. [*k*] Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 19, & 32.

Seat,

Seat, θρόνον Αποστολικὸν, the Apoſtolical Throne; becauſe St. *James*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, firſt ſat in it. And for the ſame Reaſon, *Gregory Nazianzen* [*l*] calls the Biſhop of *Alexandria*'s Seat, the Throne of St. *Mark*. It was otherwiſe called Βῆμα, and θρόνος ὑψηλὸς, the High Throne; becauſe it was exalted ſomething higher than the Seats of the Presbyters, which were on each ſide of it, and were called the Second Thrones; as we ſhall ſee hereafter, when we come to ſpeak of Presbyters. All that I ſhall obſerve farther here concerning this Throne of the Biſhops, is, That tho' it be ſometimes called the High and Lofty Throne, eſpecially by thoſe Writers [*m*] who ſpeak in a Rhetorical Strain; yet that is only meant comparatively, in reſpect of the lower Seats of Presbyters: For otherwiſe, it was a Fault in any Biſhop to build himſelf a Pompous and Splendid Throne, in Imitation of the State and Grandeur of the Secular Magiſtrates. This was one of the Crimes which the Council of *Antioch* [*n*], in their Synodical Epiſtle againſt *Paulus Samoſatenſis*, laid to his Charge, That he built himſelf an high and ſtately Tribunal, not as a Diſciple of Chriſt, but as one of the Rulers of the World; making a *Secretum* to it, in Imitation of the Secular Magiſtrates; whoſe Tribunals had a Place railed out from the reſt, and ſeparated by a Veil, which they called the *Secretum*; and the Ambitious Biſhop gave his the ſame Name; by which and ſome other ſuch like Practices, he raiſed the Envy and Hatred of the Heathens againſt the Chriſtians, as they there complain of him. It was then the great Care of the Chriſtian Church, to obſerve a *Decorum* in the Ho-

[*l*] Naz. Orat. 21. in laud. Athanaſ. T. 1. p. 377.

[*m*] Naz. Somnium de Eccl. Anaſtaſ. Sublimi Throno inſidere mihi videbar. Id. Orat. 20. in Laud Baſil. p. 342. ὅτε τὸν ὑψηλὸν τ ὅπτικοπῆς θρόνον. &c. [*n*] Ap. Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 30.

nours

nours which ſhe beſtowed upon her Biſhops; that they might be ſuch as might ſet them above Contempt, but keep them below Envy; make them Venerable, but not miniſter to Vanity, or the outward Pomp and Oſtentation of Secular Greatneſs.

CHAP. X.

Of the Age, and ſome particular Qualifications required in ſuch as were to be Ordained Biſhops.

Sect. 1.
Biſhops not to be Ordained under 30 Years of Age, except they were Men of extraordinary Worth.

THoſe Qualifications of Biſhops, which were common to them with the reſt of the Clergy, ſhall be ſpoken of hereafter: Here I ſhall only take notice of a few that were more peculiar to them. Such as, firſt, their Age; which by the Canons was required to be at leaſt Thirty Years. The Council of *Neocæſarea* [o] requires Thirty in Presbyters; which is a certain Argument that the ſame Age was requiſite in a Biſhop. The Council of *Agde* [p] more expreſly limits their Age to that time; requiring all Metropolitans to inſiſt upon it in their Ordination. The Reaſons given by theſe Councils are; Becauſe our Saviour himſelf did not begin to teach before he was Thirty Years Old; and becauſe that is the perfect Age of Man. Therefore, tho' a Man was otherwiſe never ſo well qualify'd, the Council of *Neocæſarea* ſays, he ſhall wait, and not be Ordained ſo much as Presbyter

[o] Con. Neocæſ. Can. 11. [p] Concil. Agathen. c. 17. Presbyterum vel Epiſcopum ante Triginta annos, id eſt, antequam ad viri perfecti ætatem perveniat, nullus Metropolitanorum ordinare præſumat. *See alſo* Con. Tolet. 4. c. 18, & 19.

before that time. But whether this Rule was always obſerved from the Days of the Apoſtles, may be queſtioned: For there is no ſuch Rule given by the Apoſtles in Scripture. That which goes under their Name in the Conſtitutions [q], requires a Biſhop to be fifty Years old before he is Ordained; except he be a Man of ſingular Merit and Worth, which may compenſate for the want of Years. This ſhews, that the Cuſtom of the Church varied in this Matter; and that Perſons of extraordinary Qualifications were not always ty'd to be of ſuch an Age. *Timothy* was Ordained Young; as may be collected from what the Apoſtle ſays to him, 1 *Tim.* 4. 12. *Let no Man deſpiſe thy Youth.* The Hiſtory of the Church affords many other ſuch Inſtances. *Euſebius* [r] ſays, *Gregory Thaumaturgus* and his Brother *Athenodorus* were both Ordained Biſhops very Young; ἔτι νέους ἀμφω. St. *Ambroſe* [s] ſays the ſame of *Acholius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*; That he was Young in Years, but of mature Age in reſpect of his Virtues. And *Socrates* [t] gives the like Account of *Paulus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. *Theodoret* [u] obſerves alſo of *Athanaſius*, That he was but Young when he attended his Biſhop *Alexander* at the Council of *Nice*; and yet within Five Months after, he was choſen his Succeſſor at *Alexandria*. Which probably was before he was Thirty Years old: For the Council of *Nice* was not above 20 Years after the Perſecution under *Maximian*; and yet *Athanaſius* was ſo Young, as not to remember the beginning of that Perſecution, *Anno* 303. but only as he heard

[q] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 1. [r] Euſeb. Lib. 6. c. 30.

[s] Ambr. Ep. 60. ad Anyſium. Benedictus proceſſus Juventutis ipſius, in qua ad ſummum electus eſt Sacerdotium, maturo jam probatus virtutum ſtipendio. [t] Socrat. Lib. 2. c. 6. Ἄνδρα νέον μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν, πεφυκότα δὲ ταῖς φρεσίν.

[u] Theod. Lib. 1. c. 26. νέος μὲν ὢν τὴν ἡλικίαν.

it from his Fathers. For when he ſpeaks of it, he ſays [w], He learn'd of his Parents, that the Perſecution was raiſed by *Maximian*, Grandfather to *Conſtantius*. So that if we compute from that time, we can hardly ſuppoſe him to be 30 Years old, when he was Ordained Biſhop, *Anno* 326. 'Tis agreed by all Authors [x], That *Remigius* Biſhop of *Rhemes*, was but 22 Years old when he was Ordained, *Anno* 471. And *Cotelerius* [y], after *Nicephorus*, ſays, St. *Eleutherius*, an *Illyrican* Biſhop, was conſecrated at twenty. *Ignatius* gives a plain Intimation, That *Damas* Biſhop of the *Magneſians*, was but a very young Biſhop; tho' he does not expreſly mention his Age. He calls his [z] Ordination, νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, a youthful Ordination; and therefore cautions the People not to deſpiſe him for his Age, but to reverence and give place to him in the Lord. *Salmaſius* [a] and *Ludovicus Capellus* miſerably pervert this Paſſage, and force a Senſe upon it, which the Author never ſo much as dreamt of: They will needs have it, that by the Words νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, *Ignatius* means the Novelty of Epiſcopacy in general, that it was but a new and late Inſtitution: Which is not only contrary to the whole Tenor and Deſign of all *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, but to the plain Senſe of this Paſſage in particular; which ſpeaks nothing of the Inſtitution of Epiſcopacy, but of the Age of this Biſhop, who was but young when he was Ordained.

Now, from all this it appears, That tho' there was a Rule in the Church, requiring Biſhops to be 30 Years old when they were Ordained; yet it was frequently diſpenſed with, either in Caſes of Ne-

[w] Athan. Ep. ad Solitar. T. 1. p. 853. [x] Hincmar. Vit. Remig. Baron. an. 471. p. 298. [y] Coteler. Not. in Conſt. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 1. Niceph. Lib. 3. c. 29. [z] Ignat. Ep. ad Magneſ. n. 3 [a] Vid. Pearſon. Vindic. Ignat. Præf. ad Lector.

ceſſity, or in order to promote Perſons of more extraordinary Worth, and ſingular Qualifications. Yet ſuch Diſpenſations, as qualify Boys of Eleven or Twelve Years old to be made Biſhops, are no where to be met with in the Primitive Church; tho' the Hiſtory of the Papacy affords frequent Inſtances of ſuch Promotions; as thoſe that pleaſe may ſee in a Catalogue of them, collected by Dr. *Reynolds* and Mr. *Maſon*, Two [*b*] Learned Writers of our Church.

Sect. 2.
Biſhops to be choſen out of the Clergy of the Church to which they were Ordained.

But to return to the Biſhops of the Primitive Church: Another Qualification in a Biſhop, anciently very much inſiſted on, was, That he ſhould be one of the Clergy of the ſame Church, over which he was to be made Biſhop. For Strangers, who were unknown to the People, were not reckoned qualify'd by the Canons. This is plainly imply'd by *Cyprian* [*c*], when he ſays, The Biſhop was to be choſen in the Preſence of the People; who had perfect Knowledge of every Man's Life and Actions, by their Converſation among them. St. *Jerom* obſerves, That this was the conſtant Cuſtom of *Alexandria* [*d*], from St. *Mark*, to *Dionyſius* and *Heraclas*, for the Presbyters of the Church to chuſe a Biſhop out of their own Body. And therefore *Julius* [*e*] makes it a ſtrong Objection againſt *Gregory*, whom the *Arians* obtruded on the Church of *Alexandria* in

[*b*] Vid. Rainoldi Apolog. Theſ. n. 26. Maſon *of the Conſecrat. of Biſhops.* Lib. 1. c. 5. [*c*] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Fratr. Hiſpan. p. 172. Epiſcopus deligatur Plebe præſente, quæ ſingulorum vitam pleniſſimè novit, & uniuſcujuſq; actum de ejus Converſatione perſpexit. [*d*] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Alexandriæ à Marco Evangeliſta uſque ad Heraclam & Dionyſium Epiſcopos, Presbyteri ſemper unum ex ſe electum, in excelſiori Gradu collocatum Epiſcopum nominabant. [*e*] Jul. Ep. ad Oriental. ap. Athan. Apol. 2. T. 1. p. 749.

the

the Room of *Athanaſius*; That he was a perfect Stranger to the Place; neither baptized there, nor known to any: Whereas, the Ordination of a Biſhop ought not to be ſo Uncanonical; but he ſhould be Ordained by the Biſhops of the Province in his own Church, and be ἀπ' ἀυτῆ τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀπ' ἀυτῆ τῆ κλήρᾳ, one of the Clergy of the Church to which he was Ordained. The Ancient Biſhops of *Rome* were all of the ſame mind, ſo long as they thought themſelves obliged to walk by the Laws of the Church: For *Cæleſtin* [*f*], and *Hilary* [*g*], and *Leo* [*h*], inſiſt upon the ſame thing, as the common Rule and Canon of the Church. And we find a Law as late as *Charles* the Great, and *Ludovicus Pius*, to the ſame purpoſe. For in one of their Capitulars [*i*] it is ordered, That Biſhops ſhall be choſen out of their own Dioceſe, by the Election of the Clergy and the People. Tho', as *Baluzius* [*k*] notes, this Law did not extend to very many Dioceſes: For by this time, the *French* Kings had the Diſpoſal of all Biſhopricks in their Dominions, (except ſome few Churches, which by ſpecial Privilege retained the old way of Electing:) And they did not bind themſelves to nominate Biſhops always out of the Clergy of that Church which was vacant, but uſed their Liberty to chuſe them out of any other; as now it is become the Privilege and Cuſtom of Kings and Princes almoſt in all Nations: Which is the Occaſion of the Difference betwixt the Ancient and Modern Practice in this particular. For while the ancient way of Ele-

[*f*] Cæleſtin. Ep. 2. ad Epiſc. Narbon. c. 4, 5.
[*g*] Hilar. Pap. Epiſt. 1. ad Aſcan. Tarracon. c. 3.
[*h*] Leo Ep. 84. ad Anaſtaſ. c. 6. [*i*] Capitular. Karoli & Ludov. Lib. 1. c. 84. Epiſcopi per Electionem Cleri & Populi, ſecundum Statuta Canonum, de propria Diœceſi eligantur.
[*k*] Baluz. Not. ad Concilia Gall. Narbon. p. 34. It. Not. ad Gratian, Diſt. 63. c. 34. p. 467.

ctions continued, the General Rule was for every Church to make choice of one of her own Clergy to be her Biſhop, and not a Stranger.

Sect. 3. *Some Exceptions to this Rule.*

Yet in ſome extraordinary Caſes this Rule admitted of Legal Exceptions; particularly in theſe Three Caſes: 1. When it was found for the Benefit of the Church to tranſlate Biſhops from one See to another. In this Caſe though the Biſhop was a Stranger, yet his Tranſlation being Canonical, was reckoned no Violation of this Law. 2. When the Church could not unanimouſly agree upon one in their own Body, then to pacify their Heats and end their Controverſies, the Emperor or a Council propoſed one of another Church to their Choice, or promoted him by their own Authority. Upon this ground *Nectarius*, *Chryſoſtom*, and *Neſtorius*, all Strangers, were made Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*. It was to end the Diſputes that aroſe in the Church, which was divided in their Elections, as *Socrates* [*l*] and *Sozomen* give an account of them. 3. Sometimes Mens extraordinary Merit gave them Preference, though Strangers, before all the Members of the Church to which they were choſen. As St. *Ambroſe* [*m*] obſerves of *Euſebius Vercellenſis*, that he was choſen, *poſthabitis Civibus*, before all that were Citizens or bred in the Place, though none of the Electors had ever ſeen him before, but only heard of his Fame and Character: And there are many other Inſtances of the like Nature. But excepting ſome ſuch Caſes as theſe, the Rule was generally obſerved, to chuſe no one Biſhop of any Place, who was not known to the People, and a Member of the ſame Church before.

[*l*] Socrat. Lib. 6. c. 2. Lib. 7. c. 29. Sozom. Lib. 8. c. 2.
[*m*] Ambroſ. Ep. 82. ad Eccl. Vercel.

Ano-

Sect. 4.
Biſhops to go thro' the Inferior Orders of the Church.

Another Qualification required in a Biſhop was, that he ſhould ariſe gradually to his Honour, and not come to the Throne *per Saltum* ; but firſt paſs through ſome, if not all the Inferior Orders of the Church. The Council of *Sardica* has a Canon [*n*] very full to this purpoſe: If any Rich Man or Pleader at the Law, deſire to be made a Biſhop, he ſhall not be Ordained, till he has firſt gone through the Offices of Reader, Deacon, and Presbyter: That behaving himſelf worthily in each of theſe Offices, he may aſcend gradually to the Height of the Epiſcopal Function: And in every one of theſe Degrees he ſhall continue ſome conſiderable time, that his Faith, and good Converſation, and Conſtancy, and Moderation may be known. The ſame Rule is preſcribed by the Council of *Bracara* [*o*] and ſome others. And that it was the Ancient Practice of the Church, appears from what *Cyprian* ſays [*p*] of *Cornelius*, that he was not made Biſhop of *Rome* all of a ſudden, but went gradually through all the Offices of the Church, till his Merits advanced him to the Epiſcopal Throne. *Theodoret* [*q*] commends *Athanaſius* upon the ſame Account; and *Gregory Nazianzen* [*r*] ſpeaks it to the Honour of St. *Baſil*, with ſome Reflection on ſeveral Biſhops of his Age, that he did not as ſoon as he was Baptized leap into a Biſhoprick, as ſome other Ambitious Perſons did, but riſe to his Honour by Degrees. He adds, that in Mili-

[*n*] Concil. Sardic. Can. 10. [*o*] Concil. Bracar. 1. c. 39. Per ſingulos Gradus eruditus, ad Sacerdotium veniat.

[*p*] Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 103. Non iſte ad Epiſcopatum ſubitò pervenit, ſed per omnia Eccleſiaſtica Officia promotus, & in divinis Adminiſtrationibus Dominum ſæpe promeritus, ad Sacerdotii ſublime faſtigium cunctis Religionis Gradibus aſcendit. [*q*] Theod. Lib. 1. c. 25.

[*r*] Naz. Orat. 20. in laud. Baſil. p. 335.

tary Affairs this Rule was generally obſerved; every great General is firſt a common Soldier, then a Captain, then a Commander: And it would be happy for the Church, ſays he, if Matters were always ſo ordered in it. By this time it ſeems this Rule was frequently tranſgreſſed, without any Reaſon or Neceſſity; but only by the Ambition of ſome who affected the Office of Biſhop, yet were not willing to undergo the Inferior Offices that were preparative to it.

Sect. 5. *Deacons might be ordained Biſhops, tho' never ordained Preſbyters.*

But I muſt obſerve, that it was not always neceſſarily required that a Man ſhould be ordained Presbyter firſt in order to be made a Biſhop: For Deacons were as commonly made Biſhops as any other. *Cæcilian* was no more than Archdeacon [s] of *Carthage*, when he was Ordained Biſhop, as we learn from *Optatus*. And both *Theodoret* [t] and *Epiphanius* [u] ſay, that *Athanaſius* was but a Deacon, when he was made Biſhop of *Alexandria*. *Liberatus* obſerves the ſame [w] of *Peter Moggus* and *Eſaias*, two other Biſhops of *Alexandria*: As alſo of *Agapetus* [x] and *Vigilius*, Biſhops of *Rome*. *Socrates* [y] and *Theodoret* [z] relate the ſame of *Felix* Biſhop of *Rome*, who was Ordained in the Place of *Liberius*. *Euſebius* [a] takes notice of one of his own Name, a Deacon of *Alexandria*, who was made Biſhop of *Laodicea*. And *Socrates* [b] ſays, *Chryſoſtom* made *Heraclides*, one of his own Deacons, Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and *Serapion* Biſhop of *Heraclea*. And that this was

[s] Optat. Lib. 1. p. 41. [t] Theodor. Lib. 1. c. 25. [u] Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. [w] Liberat. Breviar. c. 16, & 18. [x] Liberat. ibid. c. 21, & 22. [y] Socrat Lib. 2. c. 37. [z] Theod. Lib. 2. c. 17. [a] Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 11. [b] Socrat. Lib. 6. c. 11. Lib. 6. c. 4, & 17.

a gene-

a general Practice, and agreeable to Canon, appears also from a Letter of Pope *Leo*, where speaking of the Election of a Metropolitan, he says [c] he ought to be chosen either out of the Presbyters, or out of the Deacons of the Church.

Sect. 6. *Bishops in Cases of Necessity chosen out of the Inferior Orders.*

Sometimes in Cases of Necessity Bishops were chosen out of the Inferior Orders, Subdeacons, Readers, &c. *Liberatus* says, *Silverius*, who was Competitor with *Vigilius* for the Bishoprick of *Rome*, was but a [d] Subdeacon. And St. *Austin* himself, when he erected his new Bishoprick at *Fussala*, being disappointed of the Person whom he intended to have had consecrated Bishop, offered one *Antonius* a Reader to the Primate to be ordained Bishop in his room; and the Primate without any Scruple immediately ordained him; though as St. *Austin* [e] testifies, he was but a young Man, who had never shewed himself in any other Office of the Church beside that of Reader.

Sect. 7. *And in some extraordinary Cases ordained immediately from Laymen.*

There want not also several Instances of Persons, who were ordained Bishops immediately of Laymen, when God by his particular Providence seemed to point them out as the fittest Men in some certain Junctures, to be employed in his Service. Thus it was in the known Case of St. *Ambrose*, who was but newly baptized, when he was ordained Bishop, as both *Paulinus* [f] and all the Historians testify. When the People of *Milan* were so divided

[c] Leo Ep. 84. c. 6. Ex Presbyteris ejusdem Ecclesiæ, vel ex Diaconibus eligatur. [d] Liberat. Brev. c. 22.

[e] Aug. Ep. 261. ad Cælestin. [f] Paulin. Vit. Ambros. p. 3. Ruffin. Lib. 2. c. 11. Theod. Lib. 4. c. 6. & 7. Socrat. Lib. 4. c. 30. Sozom. Lib. 6. c. 24.

in

in the Election of a Bishop, that the whole City was in an Uproar, he being Prætor of the Place, came in upon them to appease the Tumult, as by Vertue of his Office he thought himself obliged to do; and making an Eloquent Speech to them, it had a sort of Miraculous Effect upon them: For they all immediately left off their Dispute, and unanimously cried out, They would have *Ambrose* to be their Bishop. Which the Emperor understanding, and looking upon it as a Providential Call, he ordered him to be baptized (for he was yet but a Catechumen) and in a few days after to be ordained their Bishop. St. *Cyprian* was another Instance of the like Providential Dispensation. For *Pontius* [*g*] says in his Life, that he was chosen Bishop by the Judgmenr of God, and the Favour of the People, though he was but a *Neophyte*, or newly baptized. *Socrates* [*h*] and *Sozomen* [*i*] say the same of *Nectarius*, *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Successor at *Constantinople*, that he was chosen Bishop by the Second General Council, whilst he had his Mystical Garments on him, meaning those White Garments, which the newly Baptized were used to wear. *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Pontus*, St. *Basil*'s Predecessor, was not baptized, but only a Catechumen, when he was chosen Bishop, as *Nazianzen* himself [*k*] informs us. And *Eucherius* was but a Monk, that is, a Layman, when he was chosen and ordained Bishop of *Lions*, as *Baronius* [*l*] says, from *Hilarius Arelatensis* in the Life of *Honoratus*. *Chrysostom* [*m*] seems to say

[*g*] Pont. Vit. Cypr. p. 2. Judicio Dei & Plebis favore ad Officium Sacerdotii & Episcopatus Gradum adhuc Neophytus, & ut putabatur Novellus electus est. [*h*] Socrat. Lib. 5. c. 8. [*i*] Sozom. Lib. 7. c. 8. Τὴν μυστικὴν ἐσθῆτα ἔτι ἠμφιεσμένος, &c. [*k*] Naz. Orat. 19. de laud. Patr. T. 1. p. 308. [*l*] Baron. an. 441. p. 9. [*m*] Chrys. Hom. 31. de S. Philogon. T. 1. p. 397.

the

the ſame of *Philogonius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, when he reports of him, that he was taken from the Court of Judicature, and carried from the Judges Bench to the Biſhops Throne, ἀπὸ βήματος δικαστικοῦ ἐπὶ βῆμα ἱερὸν. In all theſe Inſtances there ſeems to have been the Hand of God and the Direction of Providence, which ſuperſedes all ordinary Rules and Canons: And therefore theſe Ordinations were never cenſured as Uncanonical or Irregular, though contrary to the Letter of a common Rule; becauſe the Rule it ſelf was to be underſtood with this Limitation and Exception, as one of the ancient Canons [n] explains it ſelf, and all others that relate to this Matter; ſaying, One that is newly converted from *Gentiliſm*, or a Vicious Life, ought not preſently to be advanced to a Biſhoprick: For it is not fit, that he who has yet given no Proof of himſelf, ſhould be made a Teacher of others; unleſs it be ſo ordered by the Grace and Appointment of God himſelf, εἰ μή τις κατ' ἐπιτροπὴν χάριν τοῦτο γένοιτο. For in this Caſe there could be no Diſpute; the Will of God being Superior to all Human Canons whatſoever. And therefore though the ſame Limitation be not expreſs'd in other Canons, yet it is evident that they are always to be underſtood with this Exception. Upon which account it was not reckoned any Breach of Canon, to make a Layman Biſhop, when Providence ſeemed firſt to grant a Diſpenſation, by directing the Church to be unanimous in the Choice of ſuch a Perſon. They did not in ſuch Caſes make a Layman receive one Order one Day, and another the next, and ſo go through the ſeveral Orders in the Compaſs of a Week, but made him Biſhop at once, when need required, without any other Ordination. The contrary Cuſtom is a Modern Practice, ſcarce

[n] Canon. Apoſt. c. 80.

ever

ever heard of till the time of *Photius*, *Ann.* 858, who to avoid the Imputation of not coming gradually to his Biſhoprick, was on the firſt day made a Monk, on the 2d a Reader, on the 3d a Subdeacon, on the 4th a Deacon, on the 5th a Presbyter, and on the 6th a Patriarch, as *Nicetas David* [*o*] a Writer of that Age informs us in the Life of *Ignatius*. *Spalatenſis* [*p*] obſerves the ſame Practice to be continued in the *Romiſh* Church, under pretence of complying with the ancient Canons; though nothing can be more contrary to the true Intent and Meaning of them; which was, That Men ſhould continue ſome Years in every Order, to give ſome Proof of their Behaviour to the Church, and not paſs curſorily through all Orders in Five or Six Days time; which Practice, as it does not anſwer the End of the Canons, ſo it is altogether without Precedent in the Primitive Church.

CHAP. XI.

Of ſome particular Laws and Cuſtoms obſerved about the Ordination of Biſhops.

Sect. 1. *Biſhopricks not to be void above Three Months.*

WHen any Biſhoprick became void by the Death or Ceſſion of its Biſhop, then foraſmuch as Biſhops were looked upon as a neceſſary conſtituent Part of the Church, all imaginable Care was taken to fill up the Vacancy with all convenient Speed. In the *African* Churches a Year was the utmoſt Limits that

[*o*] Nicet. Vit. Ignat. Concil. Tom. 8. p. 1199.
[*p*] Spalat. de Repub, Lib. 3. c. 4. n. 19. p. 430.

was

was allowed for a Vacancy; for if within that time a new Election was not made, he that was appointed Administrator of the Church during the Vacancy, whose Business it was to procure and hasten the Election, was to be turned out of his Office, and a new one put in his room, by a Canon of the 5th Council [q] of *Carthage*, which is also confirmed in the *African* [r] *Code*. But in other Places this was limited to a much shorter Time: For by a Canon [s] of the General Council of *Chalcedon*, every Metropolitan is obliged to ordain a new Bishop in the vacant See within the space of Three Months, under pain of Ecclesiastical Censure, unless some unavoidable Necessity forced him to defer it longer.

Sect. 2. *In some Places a new Bishop was chosen before the old one was Buried.*

At *Alexandria* the Custom was to proceed immediately to Election as soon as the Bishop was dead, and before he was interred. *Epiphanius* [t] hints at this Custom, when he says, They were used to make no delay after the Decease of a Bishop, but chuse one presently, to preserve Peace among the People, that they might not run into Factions about the Choice of a Successor. But *Liberatus* [u] is a little more particular in describing the Circumstances of it: He says, it was customary for the Successor to watch over the Body of the Deceased Bishop, and to lay his Right Hand upon his Head, and to bury him with his own Hands, and then take the

[q] Con. Carth. 5. Can. 8. [r] Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. Can. 75. [s] Con. Chalced. Can. 25. [t] Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. n. 11. μὴ χρονίζειν μετὰ τελευτὴν τὸ ὁπισκόπου. &c. [u] Liberat. Breviar. c. 20. Consuetudo quidem est Alexandriæ, illum, qui defuncto succedit, excubias super defuncti corpus agere, manumq; dexteram ejus capiti suo imponere, & sepulto manibus suis, accipere collo suo Beati Marci Pallium, & tunc legitime sedere.

Pall

Pall of St. *Mark*, and put it upon himself, and so sit in his Throne. To these Authorities we may add that of *Socrates*, who [*w*] says, That *Cyril* of *Alexandria* was inthroned the Third Day after the Death of *Theophilus*: And he intimates, that the same thing was practised in other Places: For *Proclus* Bishop of *Constantinople* [*x*] was inthroned before *Maximian* his Predecessor was interred, and after his Inthronement he performed the Funeral Office for him. And this was done at the Instance and Command of the Emperor *Theodosius*, that there might be no Dispute or Tumult raised in the Church about the Election of a Bishop.

Sect. 3. *Some Instances of longer Vacancies in Times of Difficulty and Persecution.*

Yet notwithstanding this Care and Diligence of the Church in filling up vacant Sees, it sometimes happened, that the Election of Bishops was deferred to a much longer Season. For in *Africk* at the time of the Collation of *Carthage* there were no less than Threescore Bishopricks void at once, which was above an Eighth Part of the whole. For the whole Number of Bishops was but 466, whereof 286 were then present at the Conference, and an 120 were absent by reason of Sickness or old Age; besides which, there were 60 Vacant Sees, which were unprovided of Bishops at that time, as the Catholicks told [*y*] the *Donatists*, who pretended to vie Numbers with them, though they were but 279. What was the particular Reason of so many Vacancies at that Juncture, is not said; but probably it might be the Difficulty of the Times, that Catho-

[*w*] Socrat. Lib. 7. c. 7. [*x*] Id. Lib. 7. c. 40.

[*y*] Aug. Brevic. Collat. primæ Diei. c. 14. Sane propter Cathedras, quas Episcopis vacuas apud se esse dixerunt, responsum est a Catholicis, sexaginta esse quibus Successores Episcopi nondum fuerant ordinati.

lick

lick Biſhops could not there be placed, where the *Donatiſts* had gotten full Poſſeſſion. Or perhaps it might be the Negligence of the People, who contented themſelves with Adminiſtrators during the Vacancy, and would not admit of a new Biſhop. The Council of *Macriana* mentioned by *Fulgentius Ferrandus* [z] takes notice of this Dilatory Practice in ſome Churches, and cenſures it by a Canon, which orders the Adminiſtrators, who were always ſome Neighbouring Biſhops, to be removed; and condemns ſuch Churches to continue without Adminiſtrators, till they ſought for a Biſhop of their own. Another Reaſon of long Vacancies in ſome Times and Places, was the difficult Circumſtances the Churches lay under in time of Perſecution. For the Biſhops were the Men chiefly aimed at by the Perſecutors: And therefore when one Biſhop was Martyred, the Church ſometimes was forced to defer the Ordination of another, either becauſe it was ſcarce poſſible to go about it in ſuch times of Exigency, or becauſe ſhe was unwilling to expoſe another Biſhop immediately to the implacable Fury of a raging Adverſary, and bring upon her ſelf a more violent Storm of Perſecution. The *Roman* [a] Clergy give this for their reaſon to *Cyprian*, why after the Martyrdom of *Fabian* they did not immediately proceed to a new Election: The State of Affairs, and the Difficulty of the Times was ſuch as would not permit it. *Baronius* [b] reckons the time of this Vacancy a Year

[z] Ferrand. Brev. Canon. c. 23. ap. Juſtel. T. 1. p. 449. Ut Interventores Epiſcopi conveniant Plebis quæ Epiſcopum non habent, ut Epiſcopum accipiant; Quod ſi accipere neglexerint, remoto Interventore ſic remaneant, quam diu ſibi Epiſcopum quærant. [a] Ep. 31. al. 30. ap. Cyprian. p. 58. Poſt exceſſum nobiliſſimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum eſt Epiſcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates conſtitutus.

[b] Baron. an. 253. n. 6. an. 254. n. 46.

and

and Three Months, but others [c] who are more exact in the Calculation, make it a Year and Five Months: By either of which Accounts it was above a Year beyond the time limited by the Canons. But this was nothing in Compariſon of that long Vacancy of the Biſhoprick of *Carthage*, in the time of the *Arian* Perſecution under *Genſericus* and *Hunericus*, Two Heretical Kings of the *Vandals*, which *Victor Uticenſis* [d] ſays was no leſs than 24 Years, during all which time the Church of *Carthage* had no Biſhop. But theſe were Difficulties upon the Church, and Matters of Force, not her Choice: For in times of Peace ſhe always acted otherwiſe, and did not think ſuch extraordinary Inſtances fit Precedents to be drawn into Example; much leſs to be drawn into Conſequence and argued upon, as ſome [e] have done, that therefore the Church may be without Biſhops, becauſe ſhe ſubſiſted in ſome extraordinary Vacancies without them, when ſhe could not have them: Which Argument would hold as well againſt any other Order as that of Biſhops, did but they who urge this Argument, rightly conſider it.

Sect. 4. *Three Biſhops required to the Ordination of a Biſhop.*

But to return to the Ordination of Biſhops: At the time appointed for Ordination, the Metropolitan was uſed to ſend forth his Circular Letters, and ſummon all the Biſhops of the Province to meet at the Place where the new Biſhop was to be ordained, and aſſiſt at his Conſecration. The Preſence of them all was required, if they could conveniently attend; if not, they were to ſend their Conſent in Writing: In which Caſe Three Biſhops, with the Aſſiſtance or Conſent of the Metropolitan, were reckoned a ſuf-

[c] Pearſon. Annal. Cypr. an. 250. n. 3. & an. 251. n. 6.
[d] Victor. de Perſecut. Vandal. Lib. 2. [e] Blondel. Apol.

ficient

ficient Canonical Number to perform the Ceremony of Conſecration. St. *Cyprian* [*f*] ſpeaks of it as the general Practice of the Church in his time, to have all the Biſhops of the Province preſent at any ſuch Ordination. And *Euſebius* [*g*] particularly takes notice of the Ordination of *Alexander* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who ſucceeded *Narciſſus*, that he was ordained μετὰ κοινῆς τῶν ὁμοσκόπων γνώμης, with the common conſent of the Biſhops of his Province. The Council of *Chalcedon* [*h*] calls this a Canonical Ordination, when the Metropolitan with all or moſt of his Provincial Biſhops ordain the Biſhops of their own Province, as the Canons have appointed. And the General Council of *Conſtantinople* [*i*] juſtified the Ordinations of *Flavian* Biſhop of *Antioch*, and *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, as Canonical in this reſpect, becauſe they were ordained by the Biſhops of their Provinces Synodically met together. This was the ancient Rule of the Council of *Nice*, which requires the Aſſiſtance of all the Biſhops of the Province, if they could conveniently [*k*] attend the Ordination: But foraſmuch as that either through urgent Neceſſity, or by reaſon of their great Diſtance it might happen that all of them could not be preſent, it is added, That in that Caſe Three Biſhops ſhould be ſufficient to ordain, provided the Metropolitan and the reſt ſent their Conſent in Writing. But under Three the Canons did not generally allow of. The firſt Council [*l*] of *Arles*, and the third of *Carthage*

[*f*] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Fratr. Hiſpan. p. 172. Quod apud nos quoq; & fere per Provincias univerſas tenetur, ut ad Ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam Plebem, cui Præpoſitus ordinatur, Epiſcopi ejuſdem Provinciæ proximi quiq; conveniant, & Epiſcopus deligatur Plebe præſente, &c. [*g*] Euſeb. Lib 6. c. 11. [*h*] Con. Chalced. Act. 16. C T. 4 p. 817 [*i*] Ep. Synod. ap. Theodor. Lib. 5. c. 9. [*k*] Con. Nic. Can. 4. Ἐπίσκοπον μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι. [*l*] Con. Arelat. 1. c. 21. Si non po-

[*m*] require Three beſides the Metropolitan. And the ſecond Council of *Arles* [*n*] does not allow the Metropolitan to be one of the three, but ſaith expreſly, That he ſhall take the Aſſiſtance of Three Provincial Biſhops beſide himſelf, and not preſume to ordain a Biſhop without them. 'Tis true, thoſe called the Apoſtolical [*o*] Canons and Conſtitutions [*p*], allow the Ordination that is performed by Two Biſhops only: But this is contrary to all other Canons; which are ſo far from allowing Two Biſhops to ordain by themſelves, that the Council of *Orange* [*q*] orders both the Ordaining Biſhops and the Ordained to be depoſed: And the Council of *Riez* [*r*] actually depoſed *Armentarius* for this very thing, becauſe he had not Three Biſhops to ordain him. All Churches indeed did not puniſh ſuch Ordinations with the ſame Severity, but in all Places they were reckoned Uncanonical. When *Paulinus* ordained *Evagrius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, *Theodoret* [*s*] takes notice that this was done againſt the Laws of the Church, becauſe he was ordained by a ſingle Perſon, and without the Conſent of the Provincial Biſhops. And *Syneſius* [*t*] ſays the ſame of the Ordination of *Siderius* Biſhop of *Palæbiſca*, that it was Irregular, becauſe he neither had the Conſent of the Biſhop of *Alexandria* his

---

tuerint ſeptem, ſine tribus Fratribus non præſumant ordinare.

[*m*] Con. Carth. 3. Can. 39. Forma antiqua ſervabitur ut non minus quam tres ſufficiant, qui fuerint à Metropolitano directi ad ordinandum Epiſcopum. *See alſo* Con. Carth. 6. c. 4.

[*n*] Con. Arelat. 2. c. 5. Nec Epiſcopus Metropolitanus ſine tribus Epiſcopis Comprovincialibus præſumat Epiſcopum ordinare. [*o*] Can. Apoſt. c. 1. Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν. [*p*] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 27.

[*q*] Con. Arauſic. 1. Can 21. [*r*] Con. Reienſ. Can. 1. Ordinationem quam Canones irritam definiunt, nos quoq; vacuandam eſſe cenſuimus: In qua prætermiſſa trium præſentia, nec expetitis Comprovincialium Literis, Metropolitani quoq; Voluntate neglecta, prorſus nihil quod Epiſcopum faceret oſtenſum eſt.

[*s*] Theod. Lib. 5. c. 23. [*t*] Syneſ. Ep. 67.

Me-

Metropolitan, nor Three Biſhops to ordain him. It was to avoid this Cenſure of Irregularity, that *Novatian* when he ſet himſelf up to be Biſhop of *Rome* againſt *Cornelius*, ſent for three Biſhops out of the fartheſt Corner of *Italy* to come and [*t*] ordain him, leſt it ſhould be objected againſt him, that he had not a Canonical Ordination. And upon this Account, when *Pelagius* the Iſt. was to be ordained Biſhop of *Rome*, becauſe Three Biſhops could not be procured, a Presbyter [*u*] was taken in to make up the Number. In all which the general Practice of the Church is very clearly ſeen and deſcried.

Sect. 5. *Yet Ordinations by one Biſhop allowed to be Valid, though not Canonical.*

Yet it muſt be obſerved, that though this was the common Rule and Practice of the Church, yet it was not ſimply and abſolutely of the Eſſence of Ordination. For the Church many times admitted of the Ordinations of Biſhops that were conſecrated only by one or two Biſhops. The Council of *Orange* [*w*] which orders both the Ordaining Biſhops and the Ordained to be depoſed, in caſe Two Biſhops only ordained a Biſhop with his Conſent, decrees notwithſtanding, that if a Biſhop was ordained by any ſort of Violence againſt his Will, though only by Two Biſhops, in that Caſe his Ordination ſhould ſtand good, becauſe he was Paſſive in the thing, and not Conſenting to the Breach of the Canons. And without this Paſſivity, there are ſeveral Inſtances of Ordinations by Two Biſhops only, the Validity of which we do not find diſputed. *Pelagius* Biſhop of *Rome* was reckoned a true Biſhop, though as we have

[*t*] Euſeb. Lib. 6. c. 43. ex Epiſt. Cornel. [*u*] Lib. Pontifical. Vit. Pelag. Dum non eſſent Epiſcopi, qui eum ordinarent, inventi ſunt duo Epiſcopi, Joannes de Peruſio, & Bonus de Ferentino, & Andreas Presbyter de Oſtia, & ordinaverunt eum. [*w*] Con. Arauſic. 1. c. 21.

juſt now heard, he had but Two Biſhops and a Preſbyter to ordain him. *Dioſcorus* of *Alexandria* was conſecrated likewiſe by Two Biſhops only, and thoſe under Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure; as we learn from an Epiſtle of the Biſhops of *Pontus* [x], at the end of the Council of *Chalcedon*: Yet neither that Council, nor any others ever queſtioned the Validity of his Ordination, unleſs perhaps thoſe *Pontick* Biſhops did, who call it *Nefandam atq; imaginariam Ordinationem*. *Siderius* Biſhop of *Palæbiſca* was ordained by one Biſhop; yet *Athanaſius* not only allowed his Ordination, and Confirmed it, but finding him to be an uſeful Man, he afterwards advanced him, as *Syneſius* [y] ſays, to the Metropolitical See of *Ptolemais*. *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Antioch* ordained *Evagrius* his Succeſſor, without any other Biſhop to aſſiſt him: Which though it was done againſt Canon, yet *Theodoret* aſſures us [z], that both the Biſhops of *Rome* and *Alexandria* owned *Evagrius* for a true Biſhop, and never in the leaſt queſtioned the Validity of his Ordination. And though they afterwards conſented to acknowledge *Flavian*, at the Inſtance of *Theodoſius*, to put an end to the Schiſm; yet they did it upon this Condition, that the Ordinations of ſuch as had been ordained by *Evagrius*, ſhould be reputed Valid alſo: As we learn from the Letters of Pope [a] *Innocent*, who lived not long after this Matter was tranſacted.

Sect. 6. *The Biſhop of* Rome

Hence it appears, that the Ordination of a Biſhop made by any

[x] Concil. Tom. 4. p. 960. Ordinationem ſuam a damnatis Epiſcopis, & hoc duobus, accepit, cum Regulæ Patrum—— vel tres Epiſcopos corporaliter adeſſe in hujuſmodi diſpenſationibus omnino proſpiciant. [y] Syneſ Ep. 67.

[z] Theod. Lib. 5. c. 23. [a] Innoc. Ep. 14. ad Bonifac. Eccleſia Antiochena ita Pacem poſtulavit & meruit, ut & Evagrianos ſuis Ordinibus ac Locis, intemerata Ordinatione, quam acceperant a memorato, ſuſciperet.

ſingle

ſingle Biſhop was Valid, if the Church thought fit to allow it. Nor had the Biſhop of *Rome* any peculiar Privilege in this Matter above other Men, though ſome pretend to make a Diſtinction. There is indeed an ancient Canon alledged in the Collection of *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, out of the Council of *Zella*, and the Letters of *Siricius*, which ſeems to make a Reſerve in behalf of the Biſhop of *Rome*: For it ſays, [*b*] One Biſhop ſhall not ordain a Biſhop, the *Roman* Church excepted. But *Cotelerius* [*c*] ingenuouſly owns this to be a Corruption in the Text of *Ferrandus*, foiſted in by the Ignorance or Fraud of ſome Modern Tranſcriber, who confounded Two Decrees of *Siricius* into one, and changed the Words, *Sedes Apoſtolica Primatis*, into *Sedes Apoſtolica Romana*. For in the Words of *Siricius* [*d*], there is no mention made at all of the *Roman* Church, but it is ſaid, That no one ſhall ordain without the Conſent of the Apoſtolical See; that is, the Primate or Metropolitan of the Province; and that one Biſhop alone ſhall not ordain a Biſhop, becauſe that is arrogant and aſſuming, and looks like giving an Ordination by Stealth, and is expreſly forbidden by the *Nicene* Council. So that in theſe Times the Biſhops of *Rome* were under the Direction of the Canons, and did not preſume to think they had any Privilege of Ordaining ſingly, above what was common to the reſt of their Order.

not privileged to ordain alone, any more than any other ſingle Biſhop.

[*b*] Ferrand. Brev. Canon. c. 6. Ut unus Epiſcopus Epiſcopum non ordinet, excepta Eccleſia Romana. Concilio Zellenſi. Ex Epiſtola Papæ Siricii. [*c*] Coteler. Not. in Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 3. c. 20. [*d*] Siric. Ep. 4. c. 1. Ut extra conſcientiam ſedis Apoſtolicæ, hoc eſt, Primatis, nemo audeat ordinare. It. c. 2. Ne unus Epiſcopus Epiſcopum ordinare præſumat propter arrogantiam, ne furtivum præſtitum Beneficium videatur. Hoc enim & à Synodo Nicæna conſtitutum eſt atque definitum.

Sect. 7. *Every Biſhop to be ordained in his own Church.*

The next thing to be taken notice of in this Affair, is, That every Biſhop by the Laws and Cuſtom of the Church, was to be ordained in his own Church, in the Preſence of his own People. Which is plainly intimated by *Cyprian* [e] when he ſays, That to celebrate Ordinations aright, the neighbouring Biſhops of the Province were uſed to meet at the Church where the new Biſhop was to be ordained, and there proceed to his Election and Ordination. And this was ſo generally the Practice of the whole Church, that Pope *Julius* [f] made it an Objection againſt *Gregory* of *Alexandria*, who was obtruded on the Church by the *Euſebian* Party in the room of *Athanaſius*, that he was ordained at *Antioch*, and not in his own Church, but ſent thither with a Band of Soldiers; whereas by the Eccleſiaſtical Canon he ought to have been ordained, ἐπ' αὐτῆς τ ἐκκλησίας, in the Church of *Alexandria* it ſelf, and that by the Biſhops of his own Province. This Rule was very nicely obſerved in the *African* Churches, where it was the conſtant Cuſtom for the Primate (whoſe Office it was to ordain Biſhops) to go to the Church where the new Biſhop was to be ſettled, and ordain him there. Of this we have ſeveral Inſtances in St. *Auſtin*, who himſelf was ordained in his own Church at *Hippo* [g] by the Primate of *Numidia*: And having divided his Dioceſe, and erected a new Biſhoprick at *Fuſſala*, and elected a Biſhop, he ſent for the Primate, though living [gg] at a great Diſtance, to come to the Place and ordain him there.

[e] Cypr. Ep. 68, al. 67. ad Fratr. Hiſpan. p. 172. Ad Ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam Plebem, cui Præpoſitus ordinatur, Epiſcopi ejuſdem Provinciæ proximi quiq; conveniant, &c [f] Jul. Ep. ad Oriental. ap. Athanaſ. Apol. 2. T. 1. p. 749. [g] Poſſid. Vit. Aug. c. 8. [gg] Aug. Ep. As

Sect. 8. *The ancient Form of Ordination of Biſhops.*

As to the Manner and Form of Ordaining a Biſhop, it is thus briefly deſcribed by one of the Councils [*h*] of *Carthage*: When a Biſhop is ordained, Two Biſhops ſhall hold the Book of the Goſpels over his Head, and whilſt one pronounces the Bleſſing or Conſecration Prayer, all the reſt of the Biſhops that are preſent, ſhall lay their Hands upon his Head. The Ceremony of laying the Goſpels upon his Head ſeems to have been in uſe in all Churches. For the Author [*i*] of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions (a *Greek* Writer who is ſuppoſed to relate the Cuſtoms of the 3d Century) makes mention of it, only with this Difference, that inſtead of Two Biſhops, there Two Deacons are appointed to hold the Goſpels open over his Head, whilſt the Senior Biſhop or Primate, with Two other Biſhops aſſiſting him, pronounces the Prayer of Conſecration. This Ceremony of holding the Goſpels over his Head, is alſo mentioned by St. *Chryſoſtom* [*k*] and the Author of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy under the Name of *Dionyſius*, who ſays it was a peculiar Ceremony uſed only in the Ordination of a Biſhop.

Sect. 9. *A Form of Prayer uſed at their Conſecration.*

The Author of the Conſtitutions recites one of the ancient Forms of Prayer, the Cloſe of which is [*l*] in theſe Words: "Grant to him, O Lord Almigh-

261. Propter quem ordinandum, ſanctum ſenem, qui tunc Primatum Numidiæ gerebat, de longinquo ut veniret rogans, Literis impetravi.

[*h*] Con. Carth. 4. c 2. Epiſcopus cum ordinatur, duo Epiſcopi ponant & teneant Evangeliorum Codicem ſuper Caput & verticem ejus, & uno ſuper eum fundente Benedictionem, reliqui omnes Epiſcopi qui adſunt, manibus ſuis caput ejus tangant.

[*i*] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 4. [*k*] Chryſ. de Laudib. Evang. *cited by* Habertus, p. 79. Dionyſ. Eccleſ. Hierarch. c. 5. par. 3. Sect. 1. p. 364. [*l*] Conſtit. Lib. 8. c. 5.

"ty, by thy Chriſt the Communication of the Holy "Spirit; that he may have Power to remit Sins ac- "cording to thy Commandment, and to confer Or- "ders according to thy Appointment, and to looſe eve- "ry Bond according to the Power which thou gaveſt "to the Apoſtles; that he may pleaſe thee in Meek- "neſs and a pure Heart, Conſtantly, Blameleſs, and "without Rebuke; and may offer unto Thee that "Pure Unbloody Sacrifice, which thou by Chriſt "haſt appointed to be the Myſtery or Sacrament of "the New Covenant, for a ſweet-ſmelling Savour, "through Jeſus Chriſt thy Holy Son, our God and "Saviour, by whom be Glory, Honour and Wor- "ſhip to Thee, in the Holy Spirit, now and for "ever, *Amen*". It is not to be imagined that one and the ſame Form was uſed in all Churches: For every Biſhop having Liberty to frame his own Liturgy, as there were different Liturgies in different Churches, ſo it is moſt reaſonable to ſuppoſe the Primates or Metropolitans had different Forms of Conſecration, though there are now no Remains of them in being, to give us any farther Information.

Sect. 10. *Of their Enthronement* Homiliæ Enthroniſticæ, & Literæ Enthroniſticæ.

The Conſecration being ended, the Biſhops that were preſent conducted the new-ordained Biſhop to his Chair or Throne, and there placing him, they all ſaluted him with an Holy Kiſs in the Lord. Then the Scriptures being read (according to Cuſtom, as part of the daily Service) the new Biſhop made a Diſcourſe or Expoſition upon them, which was uſually called *Sermo Enthroniſticus*, from the Time and Circumſtances in which it was ſpoken. Such was that famous Homily of *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, mentioned by *Epiphanius* [*m*] and *Sozomen*, for

[*m*] Epiphan. Hær. 73. Sozom. Lib. 4. c. 28.

which

which he was immediately ſent into Baniſhment by *Conſtantius*. *Socrates* frequently takes notice of ſuch Homilies made by Biſhops [*n*] at their Inſtalment; and *Liberatus* [*o*] ſpeaking of *Severus* of *Antioch*, mentions his Expoſition made upon that Occaſion, calling it, *Expoſitio in Inthroniſmo*. It was uſual alſo for Biſhops immediately after their Inſtalment, to ſend Letters to foreign Biſhops, to give them an Account of their Faith and Orthodoxy, that they might receive Letters of Peace and Communion again from them; which Letters were therefore called, *Literæ Enthroniſticæ*, or συλλαβαὶ ἐνθρονιστικαὶ, as *Evagrius* [*p*] terms them, ſpeaking of the Circular Letters which *Severus* Biſhop of *Antioch* wrote to the reſt of the Patriarchs upon that Occaſion. Theſe were otherwiſe called Communicatory Letters, κοινωνικὰ συγγράμματα, as the Council of *Antioch*, that depoſed *Paulus Samoſatenſis*, terms them: For the Fathers in that Council having ordained *Domnus* in the room of *Paul*, gave notice thereof to all Churches, telling them that they ſignified it to them for this Reaſon, that they might write to *Domnus*, and receive κοινωνικὰ συγγράμματα [*q*] Communicatory Letters from him: Which, as *Valeſius* [*r s*] rightly notes, do not mean there thoſe Letters of Communion which Biſhops were uſed to grant to Perſons travelling into Foreign Countries; but ſuch Letters as they wrote to each other upon their own Ordination, to teſtify their Communion mutually with one another. Theſe Letters are alſo called *Synodicæ* by *Liberatus* [*t u*], who ſays, this Cuſtom of every new Biſhop's giving Intimation of his own Promotion to thoſe of his own Order, was ſo neceſſary, that the Omiſſion of

[*n*] Socrat. Lib. 2. c. 43. Lib. 7. c. 29. [*o*] Liberat. Breviar. c. 19. [*p*] Evagr. Lib. 4. c. 4. [*q*] Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 30. [*r s*] Valeſ. Not. in Loc. [*t u*] Liberat. Breviar. c. 17. Quia Literas Synodicas non direxiſſet, *&c.*

it

it was interpreted a ſort of Refuſal to hold Communion with the reſt of the World, and a virtual Charge of Hereſy upon them.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Rule which prohibits Biſhops to be Ordained in ſmall Cities.

Sect. 1. *The Reaſon of the Law againſt placing Biſhops in ſmall Cities.*

BEfore I end this Diſcourſe about Biſhops, I muſt give an Account of Two Rules more reſpecting their Ordination. The firſt of which was; That Biſhops ſhould not be placed in ſmall Cities or Villages: Which Law was firſt made by the Council of *Sardica*, with a Deſign to keep up the Honour and Dignity of the Epiſcopal Order; as the Reaſon is given in the Canon made about it; which ſays, It ſhall not be lawful to place a Biſhop in a Village, or ſmall [w] City, where a ſingle Preſbyter will be ſufficient: For in ſuch Places, there is no need to ſet a Biſhop; leſt the Name and Authority of Biſhops be brought into Contempt. Some add to this the Fifty ſeventh Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, which forbids the placing of Biſhops in Villages, and in the Country, [x] appointing Viſitors to be conſtituted in their Room: But this Canon ſpeaks not of Abſolute Biſhops, but of the *Chorepiſcopi*, who were ſubject to other Biſhops, of which I ſhall treat particularly hereafter. However, there is no Diſpute about the *Sardican* Canon; for the Reaſon annexed explains its meaning, that it prohibits univerſally the Ordination of Biſhops in ſmall Cities and Country Places.

[w] Con. Sardic. Can. 6. Μὴ ἐξεῖναι ὃ ἁπλῶς καθίσαν ἐπίσκοπον κώμῃ τινί, ἢ ἐφαχείᾳ πόλει. [x] Concil. Laodic. c. 57.

But

Sect. 2.

Some Exceptions to this Rule in Egypt, Libya, Cyprus, Arabia, Asia minor, *&c.*

But it may be obſerved that this Rule did never generally obtain: For both before and after the Council of *Sardica*, there were Biſhops both in ſmall Cities and Villages. *Nazianzum* was but a very ſmall City; *Socrates* [*y*] calls it πόλις ἐυτελὴς, a Little one: And upon the ſame account *Gregory Nazianzen* [*z*] ſtiles his own Father, who was Biſhop of it, μικροπολίτης, a Little Biſhop, and one of the Second Order. Yet he was no *Chorepiſcopus*, but as Abſolute a Biſhop in his own Dioceſe, as the Biſhop of *Rome* or *Alexandria*. *Geræ* near *Peluſium* was but a ſmall City, as *Sozomen* [*a*] notes; yet it was a Biſhop's See. *Theodoret* obſerves the ſame of *Dolicha*, where *Maris* was Biſhop [*b*], that it was but a very little City, πολίχνη σμικρὰ he calls it; And he ſays the like of *Cucuſus* [*c*] in *Armenia*, the Place whither *Chryſoſtom* was baniſhed: Yet as ſmall a City as it was, *Chryſoſtom* [*d*] found a Biſhop there, who treated him very civilly and reſpectfully in his Exile. *Syneſius* makes mention of the Biſhop of *Olbiæ* in one [*e*] of his Epiſtles, and at the ſame time tells us the Place was but a Village; for he calls the People δῆμος κωμήτης, a Country People. So he ſays in another [*f*] Epiſtle, that *Hydrax* and *Palæbiſca* had for ſome time each of them their own Biſhop; though they were but Villages of *Pentapolis*, formerly belonging to the Dioceſe of *Erythra*, to which they were ſome time after annexed again. In *Sozomen*'s Time, among the *Arabians* and *Cyprians* it was an uſual thing to ordain Biſhops not only in Cities, but

[*y*] Socrat. Lib. 4. c. 11, & 26. [*z*] Naz. Orat. 19. de Laud. Patr. T. 1. p. 310. [*a*] Sozom. Lib. 8. c. 19 πόλις μικρὰ. [*b*] Theod. Lib. 5. c. 4. [*c*] Theod. Lib. 2. c. 5. & Lib. 5. c. 34. [*d*] Chryſ. Ep. 125. ad Cyriacum. [*e*] Syneſ. Ep. 76. [*f*] Id. Ep. 67. Κῶμαι δὲ αὐταὶ πενταπόλεως.

Villa-

Villages; as alſo among the *Novatians* and *Montaniſts* in *Phrygia*: All which he affirms [*g*] upon his own Knowledge. Some think *Dracontius* was ſuch a Biſhop, becauſe *Athanaſius* [*h*] ſtiles his Biſhoprick χώρας ἐπισκοπὴν: But whether this means that he was an Abſolute Biſhop, or only a *Chorepiſcopus*, as others think, is not very eaſy to determine. As neither what kind of Biſhops thoſe were, which the Council of *Antioch* [*i*] in their Synodical Epiſtle againſt *Paulus Samoſatenſis*, calls Country Biſhops; for perhaps they might be only *Chorepiſcopi*, or Dependant Biſhops, as *Valeſius* conjectures. But this cannot be ſaid by thoſe mentioned by *Sozomen*, nor of the other Inſtances I have given out of *Syneſius*, and the reſt of the fore-cited Authors; from whoſe Teſtimonies it plainly appears, that there were Biſhops in very ſmall Cities, and ſometimes in Villages, notwithſtanding the contrary Decree of the *Sardican* Council. It is alſo very obſervable, That in *Aſia Minor*, a Tract of Land not much larger than the Iſle of *Great-Britain*, (including but Two Dioceſes of the *Roman* Empire) there were almoſt Four Hundred Biſhops; as appears from the ancient *Notitia's* of the Church. Whence it may be collected, that *Cucuſus* and *Nazianzum* were not the only ſmall Cities in thoſe Parts; but that there were many other Cities and Dioceſes, of no very great Extent in ſuch a Number.

Sect. 3.
Reaſons for Erecting Biſhopricks in ſmall Cities.

One thing that contributed much to the Multiplication of Biſhopricks, and that cauſed them to be erected ſometimes in ſmall Places, was, That in the Primitive Church

[*g*] Sozom. Lib. 7. c. 19. Ἔστιν ὅπη καὶ ἐν κώμαις ἐπισκοπαὶ ἱερεῦσιν, ὡς οὐδὲ ἀξιολόγοις καὶ πολείοις ἔγνων. &c. [*h*] Athanaſ. Epiſt. ad Dracont. T. 1. p. 954. [*i*] Ap. Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 30. Ἐπισκόπους τῶν ὁμόρων ἀρχῶν τε καὶ πόλεων.

every

every Biſhop, with the Conſent of his Metropolitan, or the Approbation of a Provincial Council, had Power to divide his own Dioceſe, and Ordain a new Biſhop in ſome convenient Part of it, for the Good of the Church, whenever he found his Dioceſe too large, or the Places to lye at too great a Diſtance, or the Multitude of Converts to increaſe, and make the Care and Incumbrance of his Dioceſe become too great a Burden for him. This was the Reaſon why St. *Auſtin* [*k*] erected a new Biſhoprick at *Fuſſala*, a Town in his own Dioceſe, about 40 Miles from *Hippo*. It was a Place where great Numbers had been converted from the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts*, and ſome remained to be converted ſtill: But the Place lying at ſo great a Diſtance, he could not beſtow that Care and Diligence, either in Ruling the one, or Regaining the other, which he thought neceſſary: And therefore he prevailed with the Primate of *Numidia*, to come and Ordain one *Antonius* to be Biſhop there. And this was conſonant to the Rules of the *African* Church; which allowed new Biſhopricks to be erected [*l*] in any Dioceſe where there was need, if the Biſhop of the Dioceſe and the Primate gave their Conſent to it; or, as *Ferrandus* [*m*] has it in his Collection, if the

[*k*] Auguſtin. Epiſt. 261. ad Cæleſtin. Quod ab Hippone memoratum Caſtellum millibus Quadraginta ſejungitur, cum in eis regendis, & eorum Reliquiis licet exiguis colligendis---me viderem latius quàm oportebat extendi, nec adhibendæ ſufficerem diligentiæ, quam certiſſima ratione adhiberi debere cernebam, Epiſcopum ibi ordinandum conſtituendumq; curavi.

[*l*] Concil. Carth. 2. c. 5. Si accedente tempore, creſcente Fide, Dei populus multiplicatus deſideravit proprium habere Rectorem, ejus videlicet voluntate, in cujus poteſtate eſt Diœceſis conſtituta, habeat Epiſcopum. It. Con. Carth. 3. c. 42.

[*m*] Ferrand. Breviar. Canon. c. 13. Ut Epiſcopus non ordinetur in Diœceſi, quæ Epiſcopum nunquam habuit, niſi cum voluntate Epiſcopi ad quem ipſa Diœceſis pertinet, ex Concilio tamen plenario & Primatis Auctoritate.

Biſhop,

Biſhop, the Primate, and a Provincial Council, by their joint Conſent and Authority gave way to it. By virtue of theſe Canons, during the time of the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts*, many new Biſhopricks were erected in very ſmall Towns in *Africk*; as appears from the Acts of the Collation of *Carthage*; where the Catholicks and *Donatiſts* mutually charge each other with this Practice: That they divided ſingle Biſhopricks ſometimes into Three or Four; and made Biſhops in Country-Towns and Villages, to augment the Numbers of their Parties. Thus, in one place, we find *Petilian* the *Donatiſt* [*n*] complaining, That the Catholicks had made Four Biſhops in the Dioceſe of *Januarius*, a *Donatiſt* Biſhop, to outdo them with Numbers. And, in another place, *Alypius* the Catholick orders it to be entred [*o*] upon Record, That a great many *Donatiſt* Biſhops there mentioned, were not Ordained in Cities, but only in Country-Towns or Villages. To which *Petilian* [*p*] replies, That the Catholicks did the ſame; Ordaining Biſhops in Country-Towns, and ſometimes in ſuch Places where they had no People: His meaning is, that in thoſe Places all the People were turned *Donatiſts*; And for that very Reaſon the Catholick Biſhops thought themſelves obliged to divide their Dioceſes, and Ordain new Biſhops in ſmall Towns; that they might outdo the *Donatiſts*, both in Number and Zeal, and more effectually labour in reducing the ſtraying People back again to their ancient Communion with the Catholick Church. This

[*n*] Collat. Carth. 1. c. 117. Petilianus Epiſcopus dixit, In una Plebe Januarii Collegæ noſtri præſentis, in una Diœceſi, quatuor ſunt conſtituti contra ipſum; ut numerus ſcilicet augeretur.

[*o*] Ibid. c. 181. Alypius dixit, Scriptum ſit iſtos omnes in Villis vel in Fundis eſſe Epiſcopos ordinatos, non in aliquibus Civitatibus. [*p*] Ibid. c. 182. Petilianus Epiſcopus dixit: Sic etiam tu multos habes per omnes agros diſperſos: Imo crebros ubi habes, ſane & ſine populis habes.

was

was the Practice of *Africk*, and this their Reaſon for Erecting ſo many ſmall Biſhopricks in thoſe Times of Exigency: They had always an eye to the Benefit and Edification of the Church.

Gregory Nazianzen highly commends St. *Baſil*'s Piety and Prudence for the like Practice. It happen'd in his time, that *Cappadocia* was divided into Two Provinces, and *Tyana* made the Metropolis of the Second Province, in the Civil Account: This gave Occaſion to *Anthimus* Biſhop of *Tyana*, to lay claim to the Rights of a Metropolitan in the Church; which St. *Baſil* oppoſed, as injurious to his own Church of *Cæſarea*, which by ancient Cuſtom and Preſcription, had been the Metropolis of the whole Province. But *Anthimus* proving a very contentious Adverſary, and raiſing great Diſturbance and Commotions about it, St. *Baſil* was willing to buy the Peace of the Church with the Loſs of his own Rights; ſo he voluntarily relinquiſhed his Juriſdiction over that Part of *Cappadocia*, which *Anthimus* laid claim to: And, to compenſate his own Loſs in ſome meaſure, he erected ſeveral New Biſhopricks in his own Province; as, at *Saſima*, and ſome other ſuch obſcure Places of that Region. Now, tho' this was done contrary to the Letter of a Canon, yet *Nazianzen* extols the Fact upon Three Accounts. Firſt, Becauſe hereby a greater Care was taken [q] of Men's Souls. Secondly, By this means every City had its own Revenues. And laſtly, The War between the Two Metropolitans was ended. This, he ſays, was an admirable Policy, worthy the great and noble Soul of St. *Baſil*, who could turn a Diſpute ſo to the Benefit of the Church, and draw a conſiderable Advantage out of a Calamity, by making it an occaſion to guard and defend his Country with more

[q] Naz. Orat. 20. de Laud. Baſil. Tom. 1. p. 356.

Biſhops.

Biſhops. Whence we may collect, that in *Nazianzen*'s Opinion, it is an Advantage to the Church to be well ſtock'd with Biſhops; and that it is no Diſhonour to her to have Biſhops in ſmall Towns, when Neceſſity and Reaſon require it.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Rule which forbids Two Biſhops to be Ordained in one City.

Sect. 1. *The General Rule and Practice of the Church, to have but one Biſhop in a City.*

ANother Rule generally obſerved in the Church, was, That in one City there ſhould be but one Biſhop, tho' it was large enough to admit of many Presbyters. In the time of *Cornelius*, there were Forty ſix Presbyters [r] in the Church of *Rome*, Seven Deacons, as many Sub-Deacons, and Ninety four of the Inferior Orders of the Clergy: And the Body of the People, at a moderate Computation, are reckon'd by ſome [s] to be about Fifty thouſand; by others [t], to be a far greater Number; yet there was but one Biſhop over all theſe. So that when *Novatian* got himſelf Ordained Biſhop of *Rome*, in Oppoſition to *Cornelius*; he was generally condemned over all the World, as tranſgreſſing the Rule of the Catholick Church. *Cyprian* [u] delivers it as a Maxim upon this Occaſion; That there ought to be but one Biſhop in a Church at a time,

[r] Cornel. Ep. ad Fabium ap. Euſeb. Lib. 6. c. 43.

[s] *Biſhop* Burnet, *Letter* 4. p. 207. [t] Baſnag. Exerc. ad Annal. Baron. an. 44. p. 532.

[u] Cypr. Epiſt. 55. al. 59. ad Cornel. p. 129. Unus in Eccleſia ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex Vice Chriſti.

and

and one Judge as the Vicegerent of Chriſt. Therefore he ſays [w] *Novatian* was no Biſhop, ſince there could not be a Second after the Firſt; but he was an [x] Adulterer, and a Foreigner, and ambitious Uſurper of another Man's Church, who had been regularly Ordained before him. And ſo he was told not only by [y] *Cyprian*, but a whole *African* Council at once; who, in return to *Novatian*'s Communicatory Letter, which (according to Cuſtom) he wrote to them upon his Ordination, ſent him this plain and poſitive Anſwer: That he was an Alien; and that none of them could communicate with him, who had attempted to erect a Prophane Altar, and ſet up an Adulterous Chair, and offer Sacrilegious Sacrifice againſt *Cornelius* the true Biſhop; who had been Ordained by the Approbation of God, and the Suffrage of the Clergy and People. There were, indeed, ſome Confeſſors at *Rome*, who at firſt ſided with *Novatian*: But *Cyprian* [z] wrote a Remonſtrating Letter to them, wherein he ſoberly laid before them the Sinfulneſs of their Practice; And his Admonition wrought ſo effectually on ſome of the Chief of them, that not long after they returned to *Cornelius*, and publickly confeſſed their Fault in theſe Words: We acknowledge our Error; We have been

[w] Id. Epiſt 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p 104. Cum poſt primum ſecundus eſſe non poſſit, quiſquis poſt unum, qui ſolus eſſe debeat, factus eſt, non jam Secundus ille, ſed nullus eſt.

[x] Ibid. p. 112. Niſi ſi Epiſcopus tibi videtur, qui Epiſcopo in Eccleſia à Sedecim Coepiſcopis facto, Adulter atque Extraneus, Epiſcopus fieri à deſertoribus per ambitum nititur.

[y] Cypr. Ep. 67. al. 68. ad Steph. p. 177. Se foris eſſe cœpiſſe, nec poſſe à quoquam noſtrum ſibi communicari; qui, Epiſcopo Cornelio in Catholica Eccleſia de Dei judicio, & Cleri ac Plebis ſuffragio ordinato, profanum Altare erigere Adulteram Cathedram collocare, & Sacrilega contra verum Sacerdotem Sacrificia offerre tentaverit. [z] Cypr. Ep. 54 al 46 ad Nicoſtrat. & Maxim.

impoſed upon and deluded by treacherous and deceitful Words: For though we ſeemed to communicate with a Schiſmatical and Heretical Man, yet our Mind was always ſincerely in the Church. For we are not ignorant, [a] that as there is but one God, one Chriſt the Lord, and one Holy Spirit; ſo there ought to be but one Biſhop in a Catholick Church. *Pamelius* [b] and others, who take this for a Confeſſion of the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Supremacy, betray either groſs Ignorance, or great Partiality for a Cauſe: For though this was ſpoken of a Biſhop of *Rome*, yet it was not peculiar to him, but the common Caſe of Biſhops in all Churches. *Ignatius* and all the Writers after him, who have ſaid any thing of Biſhops, always ſpeak of a ſingle Biſhop in every Church: And tho' [c] *Origen* ſeems to ſay otherwiſe, that there were Two Biſhops in every Church; yet as he explains his own Notion, his Meaning is the ſame with all the reſt: For he ſays the one was Viſible, the other Inviſible; the one an Angel, the other a Man. So that his Teſtimony (tho' there be ſomething peculiar in his Notion) is a farther Confirmation of the Churches Practice.

The Writers of the following Ages do ſo frequently mention the ſame thing, that it would be as tedious, as it is needleſs to recite their [d] Teſtimonies.

[a] Cornel. Ep. 46. al. 49. ad Cyprian. Nec enim ignoramus unum Deum eſſe, unum Chriſtum Dominum, quem confeſſi ſumus, unum Spiritum Sanctum, unum Epiſcopum in Catholica Eccleſia eſſe debere. [b] Pamel. Not. in Loc.

[c] Orig Hom. 13. in Luc. Per ſingulas Eccleſias bini ſunt Epiſcopi, alius Viſibilis, alius Inviſibilis ---- Ego puto inveniri ſimul poſſe & Angelum & Hominem bonos (leg. Binos) Eccleſiæ Epiſcopos. [d] *See* Chryſoſt. Epiſt. 125. ad Cyriac. & Hom. 1. in Philip. Jerom. Epiſt. 4. ad Ruſtic. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Com. in Tit. 2. Pſeudo-Hieron. Com. in 1. Tim. c. 3. Hilar. Diac. Com. in Phil. 1. 1. It. in 1 Cor. 12. 28. & in 1 Tim. 3. 12. Pacian. Ep. 3. ad Sempronian. Socrat. Lib. 6. c. 22. Sozom. Lib. 4. c. 14, & 15. Theod. Lib. 3. c. 4.

There-

Therefore I ſhall only add theſe Two Things: Firſt, That the Council of *Nice* repeats and confirms this Ancient Rule. For in the Eighth Canon, which ſpeaks of the *Novatian* Biſhops that return to the Catholick Church, it is ſaid, that any Biſhop may admit them to officiate as Presbyters in the City, or as *Chorepiſcopi* in the Country, but not as City Biſhops, for this Reaſon, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν, That there may not be Two Biſhops in one City. Secondly, That in Fact the People were generally poſſeſſed with the Opinion of the Abſolute Unlawfulneſs of having two Biſhops ſit together: Inſomuch that *Theodoret* tells [*b*] us, when *Conſtantius* propoſed to the *Roman* People to have *Liberius* and *Felix* ſit as Copartners, and govern the Church in common, they unanimouſly agreed to reject the Motion, crying out, One God, One Chriſt, One Biſhop.

Sect. 2. *Yet Two Biſhops ſometimes allowed by Compromiſe, to end a Diſpute, or cure an Inveterate Schiſm.*

Yet it muſt be obſerved, that as the great End and Deſign of this Rule was to prevent Schiſm, and preſerve the Peace and Unity of the Church: So on the other hand, when it manifeſtly appeared, that the allowing of Two Biſhops in one City, in ſome certain Circumſtances and critical Junctures, was the only way to put an end to ſome long and inveterate Schiſm; in that Caſe there were ſome Catholick Biſhops, who were willing to take a Partner into their Throne, and ſhare the Epiſcopal Power and Dignity between them. Thus *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch* made the Propoſal to *Paulinus* his Antagoniſt, who though he was of the ſame Faith, yet kept up a Church divided in Communion from him. I ſhall relate the Propoſal in the Words [*c*] of *Theodoret*. *Meletius*, ſays he,

[*b*] Theod. Lib. 2. c. 17. [*c*] Theod. Lib. 5. c. 3.

the meekeſt of Men, thus friendly and mildly addreſſed himſelf to *Paulinus*: Foraſmuch as the Lord hath committed to me the Care of theſe Sheep, and thou haſt received the Care of others, and all the Sheep agree in one common Faith, let us join our Flocks, my Friend, and diſpute no longer about Primacy and Government: But let us feed the Sheep in common, and beſtow a common Care upon them. [*d*] And if it be the Throne that creates the Diſpute, I will try to take away this Cauſe alſo. We will lay the Holy Goſpel upon the Seat, and then each of us take his Place on either ſide of it. And if I die firſt, you ſhall take the Government of the Flock alone: But if it be your Fate to die before me, then I will feed them according to my Power. Thus ſpake the Divine *Meletius*, ſays our Author, Lovingly and Meekly; but *Paulinus* would not acquieſce, nor hearken to him.

We meet with another ſuch Propoſal made to the *Donatiſt* Biſhops, by all the Catholick Biſhops of *Africk* Aſſembled together, at the opening of the famous Conference of *Carthage*. There they offered them freely before the Conference began, That if they would return to the Unity and Communion of the Church, upon due Conviction, they ſhould retain their [*e*] Epiſcopal Honour and Dignity ſtill: And

[*d*] Εἰ ὃ ὁ μέσος θῶκος ἦ ἔριν γεννᾷ, ἐγὼ κὴ ταύτην ἐξελάσαι πειρᾶμαι. ἐν γὸ τέτῳ τὸ θεῖον ϖροτεθεικὼς εὐαγγέλιον, ἑκατέρωθεν ἡμᾶς καθῆσθαι παρεγγύω.

[*e*] Collat. Carth. 1. die, c. 16. Sic nobiſcum teneant Unitatem, ut non ſolum viam ſalutis inveniant, ſed nec Honorem Epiſcopatus amittant. —— Poterit quippe unuſquiſque noſtrum, Honoris ſibi ſocio copulato, viciſſim ſedere eminentius, ſicut Peregrino Epiſcopo juxta conſidente Collega. Hoc cum alternis Baſilicis utriſque conceditur, uterq; ab alterutro Honore mutuo prævenitur: Quia ubi præceptio Charitatis dilataverit Corda, poſſeſſio Pacis non ſit anguſta, ut uno eorum defuncto, deinceps ja

And becauſe this could not be done, as the Circumſtances and Caſe of the Church then were, without allowing Two Biſhops for ſome time to be in the ſame City, it was farther propoſed, That every Catholick Biſhop ſhould take the other to be his Copartner, and ſhare the Honour with him; allowing him to ſit with him in his own Chair, as was uſual for Biſhops to treat their Fellow Biſhops, that were Strangers; and alſo granting him a Church of his own, where he might be capable of returning him the like Civility: That ſo they might pay mutual Reſpect and Honour to each other, and take their turns to ſit higheſt in the Church, till ſuch times as one of them ſhould die; and then the Right of Succeſſion ſhould be always in a ſingle Biſhop, as it was before. And this, they ſay, was no new thing in *Africk:* For from the Beginning of the Schiſm, they that would recant their Error, and condemn their Separation, and return to the Unity of the Church, were by the Charity of Catholicks always treated in the ſame courteous Manner. From hence it is plain, that this had been the Practice of *Africk* for above one whole Century; and the preſent Biſhops propoſed to follow the Example of their Predeceſſors, in making this Conceſſion to the *Donatiſts*, in order to cloſe up and heal the Diviſions of the Church. But they add, That foraſmuch as this Method might not be acceptable to all Chriſtian People, who would

jam ſingulis ſinguli, priſtino more, ſuccedant. Nec novum aliquid fiet: Nam hoc ab ipſius Separationis Exordio, in eis qui damnato nefariæ diſceſſionis errore, unitatis dulcedinem vel ſero ſapuerunt, Catholica Dilectio cuſtodivit. Aut ſi forte Chriſtiani Populi ſingulis delectantur Epiſcopis, & duorum Conſortium, inuſitata rerum facie, tolerare non poſſunt: Utrique de medio ſecedamus; & Eccleſiis in ſingulis, damnata ſchiſmatis cauſa in unitate pacifica conſtitutis, ab his qui ſinguli in Eccleſiis ſingulis invenientur, unitati factæ per longa neceſſaria ſinguli conſtituantur Epiſcopi.

be much better pleaſed to ſee only a ſingle Biſhop in every Church, and perhaps would not endure the Partnerſhip of Two, which was an unuſual thing; They therefore propoſed in this Caſe, that both the Biſhops ſhould freely reſign, and ſuffer a ſingle Biſhop to be choſen by ſuch Biſhops as were fingly poſſeſſed of other Churches So that at once they teſtify both what was the uſual and ordinary Rule of the Church, to have but one Biſhop in a City, and alſo how far they were willing to have receded, in order to eſtabliſh the Peace and Unity of the Church in that extraordinary Juncture. I have been the more eaſily tempted to recite this Paſſage at large, not only becauſe it is a full Proof of all that has been aſſerted in this Chapter, but becauſe it gives us ſuch an Inſtance of a Noble, Self-denying Zeal, and Charity, as is ſcarce to be parallel'd in any Hiſtory; and ſhews us the Admirable Spirit of thoſe Holy Biſhops, among whom St. *Auſtin* was a Leader.

Sect. 3. *The Opinions of Learned Men concerning Two Biſhops in a City in the Apoſtolick Age, one of the* Jews, *and the other of the* Gentiles.

Some very Learned [a] Perſons are farther of Opinion, that this Rule about one Biſhop in a City, did not take place in the Apoſtolical Age: For they think that before the perfect Incorporation and Coalition of the *Jews* and *Gentiles* into one Body, there were Two Biſhops in many Cities, one of the *Jews*, and another of the *Gentiles*. Thus they think it was at *Antioch*, where *Euodius* and *Ignatius* are ſaid to be Biſhops ordained by the Apoſtles; as alſo *Linus* and *Clemens* at *Rome*, the one ordained by St. *Peter* Biſhop of the *Jews*, and the other by St. *Paul* Biſhop of the *Gentiles* *Epiphanius* ſeems to have been of this Opinion:

[a] Pearſon. Vind. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 13. p. 414. Hammond. Diſſert. 5. adv. Blondel. c. 1.

For

For he ſays, [b] *Peter* and *Paul* were the firſt Biſhops of *Rome*; and he makes it a queſtion whether they did not ordain Two other Biſhops to ſupply their Places in their Abſence. In another place [c] he takes occaſion to ſay, That *Alexandria* never had Two Biſhops, as other Churches had; which Obſervation, Biſhop *Pearſon* thinks, ought to be extended to the Apoſtolical Ages; as implying, that St. *Mark* being the only Preacher of the Goſpel at *Alexandria*, left but one Biſhop his Succeſſor; but in other Churches ſometimes Two Apoſtles gathered Churches, and each of them left a Biſhop in his Place. Yet this does not ſatisfy other Learned [d] Perſons, who are of a different Judgment, and think that tho' the Apoſtles had occaſion to Ordain two Biſhops in ſome Cities, yet it was not upon the account of different Churches of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, but in the ordinary way of Succeſſion: As *Ignatius* was Ordained at *Antioch* after the Death of *Euodius*, and *Clemens* at *Rome* after the Death of *Linus*. I ſhall not pretend to determine on which ſide the Right lies in ſo nice a Diſpute, [e] but leave it to the Judicious Reader, and only ſay, that if the former Opinion prevails, it proves another Exception to the common Rule of having but one Biſhop in a City; or rather ſhews what was the Practice of the Church before the Rule was made.

Sect. 4. *The Caſe of Coadjutors.*

To theſe we may add a third Exception in a Caſe that is more plain, which was that of the Coadjutors. Theſe were ſuch Biſhops as were ordained to aſſiſt ſome other Biſhops in caſe of Infirmity or Old Age, and were to be Sub-

[b] Epiphan. Hær. 27. Carpocrat. n. 6. [c] Idem. Hær. 68. Meletian. n. 6. [d] Coteler. Not. in Conſtitut. Apoſt. Lib. 7. c. 46. [e] *Biſhop* Pearſon *himſelf altered his Opinion. See his* Diſſert. 2. de Succeſſione Rom. Pontif. c. 3.

ordinate to them as long as they lived, and ſucceed them when they died. Thus when *Narciſſus* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* was diſabled by reaſon of his great Age, (being a hundred and Twenty years old) *Alexander* was made his Coadjutor. *Euſebius* [*f*] and St. *Jerom* both ſay it was done by Revelation; but they do not mean, that *Narciſſus* needed a Revelation to Authorize him to take a Coadjutor, but only to point out to him that particular Man: For *Alexander* was a Stranger, and a Biſhop already in another Country, ſo that without a Revelation he could not have been judged qualified for this Office; but being once declared to be ſo, there was no ſcruple upon any other Account, but by the unanimous Conſent [*g*] of all the Biſhops in *Paleſtine*, he was choſen to take part with *Narciſſus* in the Care and Government of the Church. *Valeſius* [*h*] reckons this the firſt Inſtance of any Coadjutor to be met with in ancient Hiſtory, but there are ſeveral Examples in the following Ages. *Theotecnus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* made *Anatolius* his Coadjutor, deſigning him to be his Succeſſor; ſo that for ſome time they [*i*] both governed the ſame Church together: *Maximus* [*k*] is ſaid by *Sozomen* to be Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, together with *Macarius*. *Orion* Biſhop of *Palæbiſca*, being grown old, ordained *Siderius* his Coadjutor and Succeſſor, as *Syneſius* [*l*] informs us. So *Theodoret* [*m*] takes notice that *John* Biſhop of *Apamea* had one *Stephen* for his Collegue. And St. *Ambroſe* [*n*] mentions one

[*f*] Euſeb. Lib. 6 c. 11. [*g*] Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Alexandro. Cunctis in Palæſtina Epiſcopis in unum congregatis, adnitente quoq; ipſo vel maxime Narciſſo, Hieroſolymitanæ Eccleſiæ cum eo gubernaculum ſuſcepit. [*h*] Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. Lib. 6. c. 11. [*i*] Euſeb. Lib. 7. c. 32. ἄμφω τὴν αὐτῆς παροικίας. [*k*] Sozom. Lib 2. c. 20. [*l*] Syneſ. Ep. 67. [*m*] Theod. Lib. 5. c. 4. [*n*] Ambr. 79. ad Theophil. Fratri noſtro & Coepiſcopo Baſſo in Conſortium regendæ Eccleſiæ datus eſt Senecio.

Senecio,

Senecio, who was Coadjutor to *Baſſus*. In the ſame manner *Gregory Nazianzen* was Biſhop of *Nazianzum* together with his aged Father. *Baronius* indeed [*o*] denies that ever he was Biſhop of *Nazianzum*, but St. *Jerom* [*p*] and all the ancient Hiſtorians, *Socrates* [*q*], *Sozomen* [*r*], *Ruffin* [*s*], and *Theodoret* [*t*] expreſly aſſert it; though ſome of them miſtake in calling him his Father's Succeſſor: For he was no otherwiſe Biſhop of *Nazianzum*, but only as his Father's Coadjutor. He entred upon the Office with this Proteſtation, That he would not be obliged to continue Biſhop there any longer than his Father lived, as he himſelf acquaints [*u*] us in his own Life, and other Places; ſo that after his Father's Death he actually Reſigned, and getting *Eulalius* to be ordained in his room, he betook himſelf [*w*] to a private Life. All which evidently proves that he was not his Father's Succeſſor, but only his Coadjutor. I will but add one Inſtance more of this Nature, which is the known Caſe of St. *Auſtin*, who was ordained Biſhop of *Hippo* whilſt *Valerius* was living, and ſat with him [*x*] for ſome time as his Coadjutor; which he did by the conſent of the Primate of *Carthage*, and the Primate of *Numidia*, who ordained him. *Poſſidius* ſays, he had ſome ſcruple upon him at firſt, becauſe he looked upon it as contrary to the Cuſtom of the Church: But being told, that it was a thing commonly practiſed both in the *African* and *Tranſmarine* Churches, he yielded with ſome Reluctancy to be ordained. Theſe Inſtances are evident Proof, that

[*o*] Baron. an. 371. n 106. [*p*] Hieron. de Script. Eccl. Gregorius primum Saſimorum, deinde Nazianzenus Epiſcopus, *&c.*
[*q*] Socrat. Lib. 4. c. 26. [*r*] Sozom. Lib. 6. c. 17. [*s*] Ruffin. Lib. 2. c 9. [*t*] Theodor. Lib. 5. c. 8. [*u*] Naz. Carm. de Vita ſua. It. Orat. 8. ad Patr. [*w*] Naz. Ep. 42. ad Greg. Nyſſ.
[*x*] Poſſid. Vit. Aug. c. 8. Paulin. Ep. 46. ad Roman. Aug. Ep. 34. & 110.

it

it was not thought contrary to the true ſenſe of the Canon, in caſe of Infirmity or old Age, to have Co-adjutors in the Church: Though, 'tis true, St. *Auſtin* was of Opinion that his own Ordination was not Regular, when afterward he came to know the *Nicene* Canon, which he did not know before; and for this Reaſon he would not ordain [y] *Eradius* Biſhop whilſt he himſelf lived, though he had nominated him with the conſent of the Church to be his Succeſſor. But all Men did not underſtand the Canon in this ſtrict and rigorous Senſe that St. *Auſtin* did, as abſolutely forbidding two Biſhops to be in a Church at the ſame time in all Caſes whatſoever, but only when there was no juſt Reaſon, and the Neceſſities of the Church did not require it: But if there was a reaſonable Cauſe to have more Biſhops than one, as when a Biſhop was unable to execute his Office, or in any the like Caſe, the Canon did not oblige, as appears from the Inſtances that have been mentioned, and ſeveral others that might be added to them.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Chorepiſcopi, Περιοδευταὶ, *and Suffragan Biſhops: And how theſe differed from one another.*

Sect. 1. *Of the reaſon of the Name* Chorepiſcopi,

AS the Biſhops, when they were diſabled by old Age or Infirmity, ordained themſelves Co-

[y] Aug. Ep. 110. Quod reprehenſum eſt in me, nolo reprehendi in Filio meo. Erit Presbyter ut eſt, quando Deus voluerit futurus Epiſcopus.

adjutors

adjutors in the City: So when their Dioceſes were enlarged by the Converſion of *Pagans* in the Country and Villages at a great diſtance from the City-Church, they created themſelves another ſort of Aſſiſtants in the Country, whom they called *Chorepiſcopi*; who were ſo named, not becauſe they were *ex Choro Sacerdotum*, as a *Latin* Writer [z] by miſtake derives the Word, but becauſe they were ὁ χώρας ἐπίσκοποι, Country-Biſhops, as the Word properly ſignifies, and not Presbyters of the City Regions, as *Salmaſius* underſtands it.

and the Miſtake of ſome about it.

Now though the Name does in ſome meaſure determine their Quality, yet great Diſpute has been among Learned Men concerning the Nature of this Order. Among the Schoolmen and Canoniſts 'tis a received Opinion, that they were only Presbyters; as may be ſeen in *Turrian* [a], *Eſtius* [b], *Antonius Auguſtinus* [c] and *Gratian* [d], who are followed not only by *Salmaſius* [e], but by [f] *Spalatenſis*, [g] Dr. *Field*, and Dr. *Forbes* [h], the laſt of which brings ſeveral Arguments to prove that they were mere Presbyters, and never had any Epiſcopal Ordination.

Sect. 2.
Three different Opinions about the Nature of this Order; 1ſt. That they were mere Presbyters.

Others think there were two ſorts of *Chorepiſcopi*, ſome that had Epiſcopal Ordination, and others that were ſimple Presbyters: Which is the Opinion of *Cabaſſutius* [i],

Sect. 3.
A 2d Opinion, that ſome of them were Presbyters, and ſome of them Biſhops.

[z] Raban. Maur. de Inſtit. Sacerd. Lib. 1. c. 5. Salmaſ. de Primat. c. 1. [a] Turrian Not. in Can. 54. Con. Nic. Arabic. [b] Eſt. in 4. Sent. Diſt. 24. §. 30. [c] Ant. Auguſt. Epit. Jur. Can. Lib. 6. Tit. 1. c. 8, 11, 13, [d] Grat. Diſt. 6. c. 4, 5. [e] Walo Meſſalin. c. 5. p. 315. [f] Spalat. de Repub. Par. 1. Lib. 2. c. 9. n. 17, 18, 19. [g] Field *of the Church*, Lib. 5. c. 29. [h] Forb. Iren. Lib. 2. c. 11. Prop. 14. p. 249. [i] Cabaſſut. Notit. Concil. c. 8. p. 45.

Peter

Peter de Marca [k] and *Bellarmin* [l]. They all allow that in ſome Caſes it happened that the *Chorepiſcopi* were Biſhops, becauſe they were ordained Biſhops before they were made *Chorepiſcopi*. And thus much is certainly true: For in the Primitive Church, ſometimes Biſhops were ordained to a Place, but not received, either through the perverſeneſs of the People, or by reaſon of Perſecution, or the like Cauſe: And ſuch Biſhops (whom the ancient Writers [m] and Canons term χολαῖοι and χολάζοντες ἐπίσκοποι, vacant Biſhops) not being permitted to Officiate in their own Church, were admitted to act as *Chorepiſcopi* under any other Biſhop that would entertain them. The Council of *Nice* [n] made the like Proviſion for ſuch of the *Novatian* Biſhops as would return to the Catholick Church; that the Biſhop of the Place ſhould admit them either to the Office of a City-Presbyter, or a *Chorepiſcopus*; that there might not be two Biſhops in one City. And ſo it was determined likewiſe by the ſame Council [o] in the Caſe of the *Meletian* Biſhops, that upon their return to the Unity of the Church, they ſhould be allowed to officiate in Subordination to the Biſhops of the Catholick Church. Now 'tis plain that all ſuch *Chorepiſcopi* as theſe were properly Biſhops, becauſe they were originally ordained Biſhops before they came to act in the Quality of Country-Biſhops under others. But for all the reſt, *de Marca* thinks they were only Presbyters.

Sect. 4. *The* 3d. *Opinion, that they were all*

Both theſe Opinions (which differ little from one another) are rejected by Biſhop *Barlow* [p], Dr.

[k] Pet. de Marca de Concord. Lib. 2. c. 13. [l] Bellarm. de Cleric. Lib. 1. c. 17. [m] Socrat. H. E. Lib. 4. c. 7. Conc. Antioch. Can. 16. [n] Conc. Nic. Can. 8. [o] Conc. Nic. Ep. Synod. ap. Socrat. H. E. Lib. 1. c. 9. [p] Barlow's *Letter to Biſhop* Uſher *in* Uſh. Let. 222. p. 520.

Hammond

Hammond [q], Dr. *Beverege* [r], Dr. *Cave* [s], and even by Mr. *Blondel* [t] himſelf, who though by ſome reckoned among thoſe of the contrary Opinion, has a long Diſſertation againſt *de Marca*, to prove that all the *Chorepiſcopi* mentioned in the ancient Councils were properly Biſhops. And there needs no fuller Proof of this than what *Athanaſius* ſays in his 2*d*. Apology, where he puts a manifeſt Diſtinction betwixt Presbyters and the *Chorepiſcopi*. For ſpeaking of the irregular Promotion of *Iſchyras*, who was made Biſhop of the Region of *Mareotis* by the *Euſebian* Faction, he ſays, *Mareotis* was only a Region of *Alexandria*, and that all the Churches of that Precinct were immediately ſubject to the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and never had either Biſhop or *Chorepiſcopus* [u] among them, but only Presbyters fixt each in their reſpective Villages or Churches. This, as *Blondel* [w] well obſerves, ſhews evidently that the *Chorepiſcopi* were not the ſame with Presbyters, however the Forger of the Decretal Epiſtles under the Name of Pope *Leo* and *Damaſus*, would have perſuaded the World to believe ſo.

Biſhops, the moſt probable.

Sect. 5

Some Objections againſt this anſwered.

But why then does the Council of *Neocæſarea* [x] ſay that the *Chorepiſcopi* were only in imitation of the Seventy? I anſwer, becauſe they were ſubject to the City-Biſhops, as the 70 Elders were ſubject to *Moſes*, or the 70 Diſciples to the Apoſtles. For whatever the

[q] Ham. Diſſert. 3. cont. Blondel. c 8. [r] Bevereg. Pandect. T. 2. Not. in Conc. Ancyr. can. 13. [s] Cave Prim. Chriſt. Par. 1. c. 8. p. 224. [t] Blondel. Apol. p. 95, *&c.* [u] Athan. Apol. 2. T. 1. p 802.

[w] Blondel. Apol. p. 127. Non unum cum Presbyteris Chorepiſcopos fuiſſe, aut eandem formam geſtaſſe, prout Decretalium ſuppoſitori ſomniare viſum eſt.

[x] Conc. Neocæſar. can. 14 χωρεπίσκοποι εἰσι μὲν εἰς τύπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα.

Coun-

Council means by the Seventy, it cannot be proved thence that the *Chorepiſcopi* were mere Presbyters.

But it is ſaid, that they could not be Biſhops, becauſe the Ordination of Biſhops was to be performed by three Biſhops, with the conſent of the Metropolitan and the Provincial Biſhops; whereas the Council of *Antioch* [y] ſays, That a *Chorepiſcopus* was ordained by one Biſhop only, the Biſhop of the City to whoſe Juriſdiction he belonged. To this the Reply is eaſy, that this was one principal difference between the City-Biſhops and Country-Biſhops, who differed both in the manner of their Ordination, and in their Power: For the one was ſubordinate to the other: Therefore thoſe Canons which require 3 Biſhops to impoſe Hands in the Ordination of a Biſhop, ſpeak only of ſuch Biſhops as were to be Abſolute and Supreme Governors of their own Dioceſe, and not of ſuch who were Subordinate to them, whom the City-Biſhops might ordain at their own Diſcretion, yet ſo as to ſtand accountable to a Provincial Synod.

Sect. 6.

The Chorepiſcopi *allowed to ordain the Inferior Clergy, but not Presbyters or Deacons, without ſpecial Licence from the City Biſhop.*

The Office of theſe *Chorepiſcopi* was to preſide over the Country Clergy, and enquire into their Behaviour, and make report thereof to the City-Biſhop; as alſo to provide fit Perſons for the Inferior Service and Miniſtry of the Church. And to give them ſome Authority, they had certain Privileges conferred on them. As 1*ſt*, they might ordain Readers, Sub-Deacons, and Exorciſts for the uſe of the Country-Churches. St. *Baſil* [z] requires of his *Chorepiſcopi* that they ſhould firſt acquaint him with the Qualification of ſuch Perſons, and take his Licence to ordain them: But

[y] Concil. Antioch. can. 10. [z] Baſil. Epiſt. 181.

the

the Council of *Antioch* [a] gives them a General Commiſſion to ordain all under Presbyters and Deacons, without conſulting the City-Biſhop upon every ſuch Promotion: And for Presbyters and Deacons, they might ordain them too, but not δίχα τῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου, without the ſpecial Leave of the City-Biſhop, under whoſe Juriſdiction both they and the Country were. And this is the meaning of the Council of *Ancyra*, [b] which ſays the *Chorepiſcopi* ſhall not have Power to ordain Presbyters or Deacons: Which we muſt interpret by the Explication given in the Council of *Antioch*, that they ſhould not be Authorized to do it without the particular Direction of the City-Biſhop, but by his Leave they might.

Sect. 7. *They had Power to Confirm.*

2. They had Power to Miniſter Confirmation to ſuch as were newly Baptized in Country-Churches. This is expreſly provided by the Council of *Riez* [c] in the Caſe of *Armentarius*, whom they reduced to the Quality of a *Chorepiſcopus*, but ſtill allowed him the Privilege of Confirming *Neophytes*; which argues that Confirmation might then be adminiſtred by the Hands of the *Chorepiſcopi* in Country-Churches.

Sect. 8. *And power to grant Letters Dimiſſory to the Clergy.*

3. They had Power to grant Letters Dimiſſory, or as they were otherwiſe called, Canonical and Irenical Letters, to the Country-Clergy, who deſired to remove from one Dioceſe to another. Thus I underſtand that Canon of the Council of *Antioch* [d] which ſays, Country-Presbyters ſhall not grant Canonical Letters, κανονικὰς ἐπιστολὰς, or ſend Letters to any Neighbouring Biſhop; but the *Chorepiſcopi* may grant εἰρηνικὰς, Letters Dimiſſory, or Letters of Peace.

[a] Conc. Antioch. can. 10.
[b] Con. Ancyr. can. 14. [c] Conc. Reienſ. c. 3.
[d] Con. Antioch. can. 8.

4. They

Sect. 9. *They had Power to officiate in the Presence of the City-Bishop.*

4. They had liberty to Officiate in the City-Church, in the Presence of the Bishop and Presbyters of the City, which Country-Presbyters had not. For so the Council of *Neocæsarea* determined in Two Canons to this Purpose [*e*]: "The Country-"Presbyters shall not offer the Oblation, nor distri-"bute the Bread and Wine in time of Prayer in the "City-Church, when the Bishop and Presbyters are "present: But the Country-Bishops, being in Imi-"tation of the Seventy, as Fellow-Labourers, for "their Care of the Poor, are admitted to offer.

Sect. 10. *And to Sit and Vote in Councils.*

5. They had the Privilege of Sitting and Voting in Synods and Councils: Of which there are several Instances still remaining in the Acts of the ancient Councils. In the first *Nicene* Council [*f*] *Palladius* and *Selucius* subscribe themselves Chorepiscopi of the Province of *Cœlosyria*: *Eudæmon* Chorepiscopus of the Province of *Cilicia*: *Gorgonius*, *Stephanus*, *Euphronius*, *Rhodon*, *Theophanes* Chorepiscopi of the Province of *Cappadocia*: *Hesychius*, *Theodore*, *Anatolius*, *Quintus*, *Aquila*, Chorepiscopi of the Province of *Isauria*: *Theustinus* and *Eulalius* of the Province of *Bithynia*: So again in the Council of *Neocæsarea* [*g*] *Stephanus* and *Rudus* or *Rhodon*, two of the same that were in the Council of *Nice*, subscribed themselves Chorepiscopi of the Province of *Cappadocia*. And in the Council of *Ephesus* [*h*], *Cæsarius* Chorepiscopus of *Alce*.

Sect. 11. *The Power of the Chorepiscopi not the*

But here I must observe, that the Power and Privileges of the *Chorepiscopi* varied much, accor-

[*e*] Con. Neocæs. Can. 13, & 14. [*f*] Con. Nic. 1. in Subscription. [*g*] Con. Neocæs. in Subscription. [*h*] Con. Ephes. Act. 1.

ding

ding to the Difference of Times and Places. For when the Synod of *Riez* in *France*, *Ann.* 439, had depoſed *Armentarius* from his Biſhoprick, becauſe he was Uncanonically ordained, they allowed him the Privilege of being a *Chorepiſcopus*, after the Example of the *Nicene* Fathers, but limited him as to the Exerciſe of his Power. For though they gave him Authority to Confirm *Neophytes*, and Conſecrate Virgins, and Celebrate the *Euchariſt* in any Country-Church with Preference to any Presbyter of the Region: Yet, 1*ſt* they denied him [*i*] the Privilege of Conſecrating the *Euchariſt* in the City-Church, which by the 13*th* Canon of the Council of *Neocæſarea*, was allowed to other *Chorepiſcopi*. 2*dly*, They confined him to a ſingle Church in the Exerciſe of his *Chorepiſcopal* Power; whereas others had Power over a whole Region. 3*dly*, They forbad him to ordain any of the Inferior Clergy even in his own Church, which other *Chorepiſcopi* were allowed to do by the 13*th* Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*. And hence it appears, that as their Power was precarious and depending upon the Will of Councils and City-Biſhops, from whom they received it; ſo by this time their Authority began to ſink apace in the Church.

ſame in all Times and Places.

Sect. 12.

Their Power firſt ſtruck at by the Council of Laodicea, *which ſet up* Περιοδῖται *in their room.*

The Council of *Laodicea* gave them the firſt Blow *An.* 360. For there it was decreed [*k*] that for the future no Biſhops ſhould be placed in Country Villages, but only Περιοδῖται, Itinerant or Viſiting Presbyters; and for ſuch Biſhops as were already Conſtituted, they ſhould do nothing without the Conſent and Direction of the City-Biſhop. In the Council of *Chalcedon* we meet with ſome ſuch Preſ-

[*i*] Conc. Reienſ. Can. 3. [*k*] Con. Laod. Can. 57.

byters expreſly ſtiled Περιοδευταὶ, as *Alexander* [*l*] and *Valentinus* [*m*], each of which has the Title of Preſbyter and Περιοδευτὴς. And ſo in the 5*th* General Council at *Conſtantinople* [*n*] one *Sergius* a Presbyter has the ſame Title of Περιοδευτὴς, Curator or Viſiter of the *Syrian* Churches: Yet ſtill the Order of the *Chorepiſcopi* was preſerved in many Places. For not only mention is made of them by *Gregory Nazianzen* [*o*] and St. *Baſil* in the 4*th* Century, but alſo by *Theodoret* [*p*] who ſpeaks of *Hypatius* and *Abramius*, his own *Chorepiſcopi*; and in the Council of *Chalcedon* in the 5*th* Century, we find the *Chorepiſcopi* ſitting and ſubſcribing in the Name of the Biſhops that ſent them. But this was ſome Diminution of their Power: For in former Councils they ſubſcribed in their own Names, as Learned Men [*q*] agree: But now their Power was ſinking, and it went on to decay and dwindle by degrees, till at laſt in the 9*th* Century, when the forged Decretals were ſet on foot, it was pretended that they were not true Biſhops, and ſo the Order by the Pope's Tyranny came to be laid aſide in the Weſtern Church.

Sect. 13. *Of the Attempt to reſtore the* Chorepiſcopi *in* England, *under the Name of* Suffragan *Biſhops.*

Some Attempt was made in *England*, at the beginning of the Reformation, to reſtore theſe under the Name of Suffragan Biſhops. For as our Hiſtories inform us, [*r*] by an Act of the 26*th* of *Henry* the VIIIth. *An.* 1534. ſeveral Towns were appointed for Suffragan Sees, *viz. Thetford, Ipſwich, Cholcheſter, Dover, Guilford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftsbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leiceſter, Gloucеſter, Shrewsbury, Briſtol,*

[*l*] Con. Chalced. Act. 4. [*m*] Ibid. Act. 10. [*n*] Con. CP. ſub. Menna Act. 1. p. 563. [*o*] Nazian. Ep. 88. Theodoro. Baſil. Ep. 181. [*p*] Theod. Ep. 113. ad Leon. [*q*] Blondel. Apol. p. 131. Bevereg. Not. in Con. Ancyr. c. 13.

[*r*] Burnet Hiſt. of Refor. Vol. 1. p. 157.

Penreth,

Penreth, *Bridgewater*, *Nottingham*, *Grantham*, *Hull*, *Huntington*, *Cambridge*, *Pereth*, *Barwick*, St. *Germans* in *Cornwall*, and the Iſle of *Wight*. Theſe Suffragans were to be conſecrated by the Archbiſhop, and two other Biſhops, and by the Act to have the ſame Epiſcopal Power, as Suffragans formerly had within this Realm: But none of them either to have or act any thing properly Epiſcopal, without the Conſent and Permiſſion of the Biſhop of the City, in whoſe Dioceſe he was placed and conſtituted. Now any one that compares this with the Account that I have given of the ancient *Chorepiſcopi*, will eaſily perceive that theſe Suffragans were much of the ſame Nature with them. But then I muſt obſerve that this was a new Name for them: For anciently Suffragan Biſhops were all the City-Biſhops of any Province under a Metropolitan, who were called his Suffragans, becauſe they met at his Command to give their Suffrage, Counſel or Advice in a Provincial Synod. And in this Senſe the Word was uſed in *England*, at the time when *Linwood* wrote his *Provinciale*, which was not above an hundred Years before the Reformation, *An.* 1430. in his Comment upon one of the Conſtitutions of *John Peckham*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, which begins with theſe Words, *Omnibus & Singulis Coepiſcopis Suffraganeis Noſtris*: To all and ſingular our Fellow-Biſhops and Suffragans: Upon the Word *Suffragans* he has this Note: [s] "They were called Suffragans, becauſe they were "bound to give their Suffrage and Aſſiſtance to the "Archbiſhop, being ſummoned to take part in his "Care, though not in the Plenitude of his Power".

Sect. 14. *Suffragan Biſhops different from the* Chorepiſcopi *in the Primitive Church.*

[s] Linwood Provinc. Lib. 1. Tit. 2. c. 1. Suffraganeis. Sic dictis, quia Archiepiſcopo ſuffragari & aſſiſtere tenentur, &c.

Whence it is plain that in his time, Suffragan Biſhops did not ſignifie *Chorepiſcopi*, or Rural Biſhops, but all the Biſhops of *England* under their Archbiſhops or Metropolitans. Thus it was alſo in other Churches: The Seventy Biſhops who were immediately ſubject to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as their Primate or Metropolitan, were called his Suffragans, becauſe they were frequently called to his Synods; as the reaſon of the Name is given in an ancient Vatican MS. cited by [t] *Baronius*.

Sect. 15. *The Suffragan Biſhops of the* Roman *Province called by a Technical Name*, Libra.

And here it will not be amiſs to obſerve, whilſt we are ſpeaking of Suffragan Biſhops, that theſe 70 Biſhops, who were Suffragans to the Biſhop of *Rome*, were by a peculiar Technical Name called *Libra*; which Name was given them for no other Reaſon, but becauſe of their Number Seventy. For the *Roman Libra*, as Antiquaries [u] Note, conſiſted of 70 *Solidi*, or ſo many Parts; and therefore the Number 70 in any other Things or Perſons, thence took the Name of *Libra*: As the 70 Witneſſes which are introduced depoſing againſt *Marcellinus*, in the Council of *Sinueſſa*, that they ſaw him Sacrifice, are by the Author of thoſe Acts [w] termed *Libra Occidua*, for no other Reaſon, as *Baronius* [x] conceives, but becauſe they were 70 in Number. And *Grotius* [y] gives the ſame Reaſon for affixing this Title on the 70 Biſhops, who were Aſſeſ-

[t] Baron. an. 1057. n. 23. Præter ſeptem Collaterales Epiſcopos erant alii Epiſcopi, qui dicuntur Suffraganei Romani Pontificis, nulli alii Primati vel Archiepiſcopo ſubjecti, qui frequenter ad Synodos vocarentur. [u] Brerewood de Ponder. & Pret. c. 15. [w] Concil. Sinueſſ. ap. Crab. T. 1. p. 190. Hi omnes electi ſunt Viri, Libra Occidua, qui Teſtimonium perhibent, videntes Marcellinum thurificaſſe. [x] Baron. an. 302. n. 92. [y] Grot. in Luc. 10. 1. Romanis Epiſcopis jam olim 70 Epiſcopi Adſeſſores Libra dicti, quòd Libra Romana tot ſolidos contineret.

ſors

sors or Suffragans to the Bishop of *Rome*; they were, as one might say, his *Libra*, or ordinary Provincial Council.

CHAP. XV.

Of the Intercessores *and* Interventores *in the* African *Churches.*

Sect. 1. *Why some Bishops called Intercessors in the* African *Churches.*

THere is one Appellation more given to some Bishops in the *African* Councils, which must here be taken notice of, whilst we are speaking of Bishops; which is the Name Intercessor and Interventor; a Title given to some Bishops upon the account of a Pro-tempore Office which was sometimes committed to them. In the *African* Churches, and perhaps in others also, upon the Vacancy of a Bishoprick, it was usual for the Primate to appoint one of the Provincial Bishops to be a sort of Procurator of the Diocese, partly to take care of the vacant See, and partly to promote and procure the speedy Election of a new Bishop. And from this he had the Name of Intercessor and Interventor.

Sect. 2. *The Office of an Intercessor not to last above a Year.*

The Design of this Office was manifestly to promote the good of the Church, but it was liable to be abused two ways. For the Intercessor by this means had a fair Opportunity given to ingratiate himself with the People, and promote his own Interest among them, instead of that of the Church; either by keeping the See void longer than was necessary; or if it was a Wealthier, or more Honourable Place than his own, by getting himself chosen into it. To

obviate any ſuch Deſigns, the *African* Fathers in the Fifth Council of *Carthage* made a Decree, That no Interceſſor ſhould continue in his Office for above a Year; but if he did not procure a new Biſhop to be choſen within that time, another Interceſſor ſhould be ſent in his Room: And the more effectually to cut off all Abuſes, and prevent Corruption, they enacted it alſo into a Law [z] that no Interceſſor ſhould be capable of ſucceeding himſelf in the vacant See, whatever Motions or Solli-citations were made by the People in his behalf. So extreamly cauti-ous were theſe Holy *African* Fathers to prevent A-buſes in matters of this Nature.

Sect. 3. *No Interceſſor to be made Biſhop of the Place where he was conſtituted Interceſſor.*

CHAP. XVI.

Of Primates or Metropolitans.

Sect. 1. *Some derive the Original of Metropolitans from Apoſtolical Conſtitution.*

THE ſame Reaſons which firſt brought in *Chorepiſcopi* and Coadjutors, as ſubordinate to Bi-ſhops in every City-Church, made the Biſhops of every Province think it neceſſary to make one of themſelves Superior to all the reſt, and inveſt him with certain Powers and Privileges for the good of the Whole: Whom they therefore named their Primate or Metropolitan, that is, the Principal Biſhop of the Province. Biſhop *Uſher* [a] derives the Origin of this Settlement from

[z] Con. Carth. 5. Can. 8. Placuit, ut nulli Interceſſori licitum ſit, Cathedram cui Interceſſor datus eſt, quibuſlibet Populorum ſtudiis, vel Seditionibus retinere: Sed dare operam, ut intra annum eiſdem Epiſcopum provideat. Quod ſi neglexerit, anno expleto, Interventor alius tribuatur.

[a] Uſſer. de Orig. Epiſc. & Metrop. Apoſto-

Apoſtolical Conſtitution. So alſo Biſhop *Beverege*[*b*], Dr. *Hammond* [*c*], *Peter de Marca* and ſome others. And there are ſeveral Paſſages in *Euſebius* and *Chryſoſtom* which ſeem to favour this. For *Euſebius* [*d*] ſays, *Titus* had the Superintendency of all the Churches in *Crete*: And *Chryſoſtom* in like manner [*e*], That the Apoſtle committed to him the whole Iſland, and gave him Power to cenſure all the Biſhops therein. He ſays the ſame of *Timothy* [*f*], that he was entruſted with the Government of the Church in the whole Region or Province of *Aſia*. And it is certain the *Cyprian* Biſhops in the Council of *Epheſus* [*g*], pleaded the Privileges of their Metropolitan to be as ancient as the Apoſtles.

Sect. 2
Others from the Age next after the Apoſtles.

But it may be doubted, whether the Apoſtles made any ſuch General Settlement of Metropolitans in every Province: And the Records of the Original of moſt Churches being loſt, it cannot be certainly proved they did. *De Marca* [*h*] thinks that though the Apoſtles gave a Model or Specimen in *Timothy* and *Titus*, yet they left it to following Ages to finiſh and compleat it. Dr. *Cave* ſays [*i*], it commenced not long after the Apoſtolick Age; when Sects and Schiſms began to break in apace, and Controverſies multiplying between particular Biſhops, it was found neceſſary to pitch upon one in every Province, to whom the Umpirage of Caſes might be referred, and by whom all Common and Publick Affairs might be directed.

[*b*] Bevereg. Cod. Can. Vind. Lib. 2. c. 5. n. 12. [*c*] Ham. Pref. to Titus. It. Diſſert 4. cont. Blondel. c. 5. [*d*] Euſeb. H. E. Lib. 3. c. 4. Τῶν ὅπῃ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι.
[*e*] Chryſ. Hom. 1. in Tit. νῆσον ἐλόκληρον---καὶ τοσούτων ὅπου κώμων κρίσιν ἐπέτρεψεν. [*f*] Id. Hom. 15. in 1 Tim.
[*g*] Con. Epheſ. Act. 7. [*h*] Marca de Concord. Lib. 6. c. 1. n. 9. [*i*] Cave Anc. Ch. Gov. p. 92.

Perhaps it took its Riſe from that common Reſpect and Deference, which was uſually paid by the reſt of the Biſhops, to the Biſhop of the Civil Metropolis in every Province; which advancing into a Cuſtom, was afterward made into a Canon by the Council of *Nice*.

Sect. 3. *Confeſſed by all to have been long before the Council of* Nice.

This is certain, that the *Nicene* Council ſpeaks of Metropolitans as ſettled by ancient Cuſtom long before, when it uſhers in the Canon about them with, ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, Let ancient Cuſtoms [*k*] be continued; and then goes on to ſpeak of the Cuſtom in *Egypt*, which was for the Biſhop of *Alexandria* to have Power over all the Churches of *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis*: Which was Metropolitical, if not Patriarchal, Power. *Epiphanius* [*l*] mentions the ſame, ſpeaking of *Alexander* and *Peter*, Biſhops of *Alexandria* before the Council of *Nice*, he ſays, They had ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοίκησιν, the Adminiſtration of Eccleſiaſtical Affairs throughout all *Egypt*, *Thebais*, *Mareotes*, *Libya*, *Ammoniaca*, *Mareotis* and *Pentapolis*. And *Athanaſius* [*m*] ſpeaking of *Dionyſius*, who was Biſhop of *Alexandria* above 60 Years before this Council, ſays, he alſo enjoyed this Power, having the Care of the Churches of *Pentapolis* and *Libya*, when *Sabellius* broached his Hereſie, and that he wrote Letters of Admonition to ſeveral Biſhops of thoſe Parts, who began to be infected with his Hereſie. Theſe are undeniable Evidences that the Biſhops of *Alexandria* were not firſt inveſted with Metropolitical Power by the Council of *Nice*, but only confirmed in thoſe Rights which by ancient Cuſtom and Preſcription they had long enjoyed. And this was alſo the Caſe of other Churches.

[*k*] Con. Nicen. can. 6. [*l*] Epiphan. Hær. 68. n. 1. & Hær. 69. n. 3. [*m*] Athan. de Sentent. Dionyſ. T. 1. p. 552.

The

The Council of *Eliberis* in *Spain* [n], ſpeaks of a *Primæ Cathedræ Epiſcopus*, a Primate or Biſhop of the firſt See: And thoſe called the Apoſtles Canons, (which were the Canons of the Greek Church in the 3*d* Century) mention a πρῶτος, or chief Biſhop in every Province, whom the reſt were to look upon as their Head [o], and do nothing without him. And it appears from ſeveral of *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles [p], that the Biſhop of *Carthage* had a Preſidency over all the other *African* Biſhops, and Power to ſend his Mandates among them. And St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of the Primate of *Numidia*, as well as the Primate of *Carthage*, before the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts*; and ſays, They gave that for one Reaſon of their Schiſm [q], that the Primate of *Numidia*, was not called to elect and conſecrate the Primate of *Carthage*. And therefore, as both the ſame St. *Auſtin* [r] and *Optatus* [s] take notice, the *Donatiſts* pretending that the Ordination of *Cæcilian* Biſhop of *Carthage* was not valid, becauſe not performed by a Primate, ſent for *Secundus Tigiſitanus*, who was then Primate of *Numidia*, to ordain *Majorinus* in his room. Now as all this was tranſacted ſeveral Years before the Council of *Nice*, ſo it proves that Primates were in *Africk* antecedent to the Eſtabliſhment of that Council.

Sect. 4. *Proofs of* Metropolitans *in the* 2d *Century.*

If we aſcend higher yet, and look into the 2*d* Century, there are ſome Foot-ſteps of the ſame Power, though not ſo evident as the former. *Lyons* in *France* was a

[n] Con. Eliber. an. 305. can. 58. [o] Can. Apoſt. c. 35.

[p] Cypr. Ep. 42. ad Cornel. Per Provinciam noſtram hæc eadem Collegis ſingulis in notitiam perferentes, ab his quoq; Fratres noſtros cum Literis dirigendos eſſe mandavimus. *See alſo* Ep. 40. ad Pleb. Carthag. Ep. 45. ad Cornel. [q] Aug. Brevic. Collat. Tert. die, c. 16. [r] Aug cont. Parmen. Lib. 1. c. 3. Venientes cum Primate ſuo tunc Secundo Tigiſitano, &c. [s] Optat. Lib. 1. p. 41.

Me-

Metropolis in the Civil Account, and *Irenæus* who was Biſhop of it, is ſaid to have the Superintendency of the *Gallican Paræciæ*, or *Dioceſes*, as *Euſebius* [*t*] words it. *Philip* Biſhop of *Gortyna* in *Crete*, is ſtiled by *Dionyſius* [*u*] of *Corinth*, Biſhop of all the *Cretian* Churches. *Polycrates* Biſhop of *Epheſus* preſided [*w*] in Council over all the Biſhops of *Aſia*; *Palmas* Biſhop of *Amaſtris* over the Biſhops of *Pontus*, and *Theophilus* [*x*] of *Cæſarea* with *Narciſſus* of *Jeruſalem*, over the reſt of the Biſhops of *Palæſtine*.

Theſe are the common Proofs, which are ordinarily alledged in this Caſe. Yet I ſhall freely own, that the three laſt of them do not cogently prove the thing in Diſpute. For preſiding in Council does not neceſſarily infer Metropolitical Power; becauſe they might preſide as Senior Biſhops, as *Euſebius* ſays expreſly one of them did, *viz.* *Palmas* Biſhop of *Amaſtris*, ὡς ἀρχαιότατος ϖρωτέτακτο, He preſided as the moſt ancient Biſhop among them. Which ſeems to be noted by *Euſebius* not without good Reaſon; for *Heraclea*, and not *Amaſtris*, was the Civil Metropolis of *Pontus*. *Blondel* from this Paſſage concludes, That at this time the Senior Biſhops in all Places were the Metropolitans. But this does not ſufficiently appear to have been the Cuſtom any where elſe but in the *African* Churches, of which I ſhall preſently give an Account: For the other Inſtances that have been given, ſeem rather to make it evident, that the Biſhops of the Civil Metropoles were generally the Primates or Metropolitans in the Church alſo.

[*t*] Euſeb. H. E. Lib. 5. c. 23. Τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικιῶν, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπισκόπει. [*u*] Dionyſ. Ep. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 4. c. 23. [*w*] Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 24. [*x*] Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 23.

'Tis

Sect. 5. *By what Names* Metropolitans *were anciently called.*

'Tis true indeed, none of theſe are expreſly called *Metropolitans*: For that Name ſcarcely occurs in any ancient Record before the Council of *Nice*: But they were at firſt termed πρῶτοι, and κεφαλαὶ, chief Biſhops, and Heads of the Province, as the Apoſtolical Canon [*y*] ſtiles them. After-Ages gave them other Names, as that of Archbiſhops, at *Alexandria* [*z*] and other Places, till that Name became appropriate to the *Patriarchs*. The Council of *Sardica* [*a*] ſtiles them Ἔξαρχοι τ ἐπαρχίας, Exarchs of the Province. St. *Auſtin* ſometimes calls them *Principes* [*b*], Princes: And Pope *Hilary* [*c*] Monarchs. But theſe being Titles of Secular Grandeur, and ſavouring too much of abſolute Sovereignty and Dominion, were expreſly prohibited by the 3*d* Council of *Carthage*, which ordered, that no Superior Biſhop ſhould be called [*d*] High-Prieſt, or Prince of the Prieſts, but only *Primæ ſedis Epiſcopus*, Primate, or Senior Biſhop. Hence it was that thoſe Biſhops, who in other parts of the World were called Metropolitans, in *Africk* had commonly the Name of Primates; though we ſometimes meet with the Name Metropolitan [*e*] in the *African* Councils alſo.

[*y*] Canon. Apoſt. c. 35. [*z*] Epiphan. Hær. 68, & 69. [*a*] Con. Sard. can. 6. [*b*] Aug. Brevic. Collat. tert. die, c. 16. Non exſpectavit Cæcilianus, ut Princeps à Principe ordinaretur. [*c*] Hilar. Ep. ad Leont. Arelatenſ. ap. Baron. an. 462. In Provincia quæ ad Monarchiam tuam ſpectat, *&c.* [*d*] Con. Carth. 3. can. 26. Ut primæ ſedis Epiſcopus non appelletur Princeps Sacerdotum, aut ſummus Sacerdos, aut aliquid hujuſmodi, ſed tantum primæ ſedis Epiſcopus. [*e*] Con. Car. 3. can. 39. Carth. 4. can. 1.

But

Sect. 6. *Primates in* Africk *called* Senes, *becauſe the oldeſt Biſhop was always Metropolitan.*

But theſe Primates in *Africk* are frequently called *Patres* and *Senes*. As in the *African* Code *Xantippus* Primate of *Numidia*, is once and again [*f*] ſtiled *Senex Xantippus*. And St. *Auſtin* writing to him, inſcribes his Epiſtle [*g*] *Patri & Conſacerdoti Seni Xantippo*. And thus in many other Epiſtles [*h*] writing to the Primates, or ſpeaking of them, he gives them the Name of *Senes*. And there was a pecuilar Reaſon for giving them this Name in *Africk*. For here the Primacy was not fixed, as in other Places, to the Civil Metropolis, but always went along with the oldeſt Biſhop of the Province, who ſucceeded to this Dignity by vertue of his Seniority, whatever Place he lived in. In other Parts of the World the Biſhop of the Civil Metropolis was commonly Metropolitan in the Church alſo: And ſo it was ordered to be by ſeveral Canons both of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches. The Council of *Antioch* [*i*] bids all Biſhops obſerve, that the Biſhop of the Metropolis has the Care of the whole Province, becauſe all Men that have Buſineſs or Controverſies to be decided, reſort from all Parts to the Metropolis. And the Council of *Turin* [*k*] upon this foot determined a Diſpute about Primacy betwixt the Two Biſhops of *Arles* and *Vienna*; Decreeing that he that could prove his City to be the Metropolis, ſhould be the Primate of the whole Province. The Council of *Chalcedon* has Two Canons [*l*], appointing thoſe Cities to be Metropoles in the Church, which were ſo in the Ci-

[*f*] Cod. can. Eccl. Afr. c. 91, & 101. [*g*] Aug. Ep. 236. [*h*] Aug. Ep. 149, 152, 235, 261, *&c.* [*i*] Con. Antioch. can. 9. [*k*] Con. Taurin. can. 2. Qui ex iis comprobaverit ſuam Civitatem eſſe Metropolim, is totius Provinciæ honorem Primatus obtineat. [*l*] Con. Chalced. can. 12, & 16.

vil

vil Diviſion of the Empire. And the Council of *Trullo* [*m*] has one to the ſame purpoſe.

But in the *African* Churches it was otherwiſe: For they were governed by Rules and Canons of their own; and their Rule was, to let the Primacy remove from City to City, and ſtill go along with the Senior Biſhop, without any regard to the Civil Metropolis, except only at *Carthage*, where the Biſhop was a fixt and ſtanding Metropolitan for the Province of *Africa* properly ſo called. But in *Numidia* and *Mauritania* this Honour was moveable; as may appear from this one Inſtance. *Conſtantina* was the Civil Metropolis of *Numidia*, as we learn both from the ancient *Notitia* of the Empire, and one of the Canons [*n*] of the *African* Code, which expreſly ſtiles it ſo: Yet the Primacy was ſo far from being ſettled here, that we never ſo much as find that the Biſhop of *Conſtantina* was at any time the Primate; but in *Conſtantine*'s time *Secundus Tigiſitanus* [*o*] was Primate of *Numidia*; in St. *Auſtin*'s time *Megalius* Biſhop of *Calama* was Primate, who by vertue of his Office [*p*], ordained St. *Auſtin* Biſhop; afterwards *Xantippus* of *Tagaſta* [*q*] ſucceeded by vertue of his Seniority, whence he is always ſtiled in St. *Auſtin* [*r*], and the *African* Councils [*s*], *Senex Xantippus*. This is ſufficient to ſhew that the Primacy in *Africk* was not confined to the Civil Metropolis, but was always conferred upon the Senior Biſhop, whoſe Seniority was reckoned from the time of his Conſecration. Some there are who pretend to ſay,

[*m*] Con. Trull. can. 38. [*n*] Cod. can. Eccl. Afr. c. 86.

[*o*] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. 1. c. 3. Ep. 68. ad Januar.

[*p*] Poſſid. Vit. Aug. c. 8. Adveniente ad Eccleſiam Hipponenſem tunc Primate Numidiæ Megalio Calamenſi Epiſcopo.

[*q*] Con. Milev. 1. in Cod. Afr. can. 84. Xantippus Primæ Sedis Numidiæ Epiſcopus. Aug. Ep. 217. Collega noſter Xantippus. Tagaſtenſis dicit, quod eum Primatus ipſe contingat, *&c.*

[*r*] Aug. Ep. 236. [*s*] Cod. can. Afr. c. 91, 101.

that

that theſe *African* Primates notwithſtanding this, were ſubject to the Biſhops of the Civil Metropoles, who were properly the Metropolitans. But there is no ground for this Opinion, and it is juſtly exploded by *de Marca* [*t*] and others, who have occaſionally touched upon this Subject.

Sect. 7. *How* African *Biſhops might forfeit their Title to the Primacy.*

'Tis true indeed, by the *African* Diſcipline a Biſhop might loſe his Primogeniture, and ſo forfeit his Title to the Primacy; as is evident from a Paſſage in St. *Auſtin* [*u*] which ſpeaks of ſuch a Puniſhment inflicted upon one *Priſcus* a *Mauritanian* Biſhop, who for ſome Miſdemeanor was denied this Privilege, though he ſtill kept his Biſhoprick: But in ſuch Caſes the Primacy did not devolve to the Biſhop of the Civil Metropolis, but to the next in order, who could prove himſelf Senior by Conſecration.

Sect. 8. *A Regiſter of Ordinations to be kept in the Primates Church. And all Biſhops to take place by Seniority,* &c.

And becauſe Diſputes ſometimes aroſe about Seniority; to prevent theſe, ſeveral good Orders were made by the *African* Fathers relating to this Matter. As firſt, that a *Matricula*, or *Archivus*, as they called it, ſhould be kept both in the Primates Church [*w*], and in the Metropolis of the Province, for Biſhops to prove the time of their Ordination by.

Then 2*dly*, Every Biſhop was to have his Letters of Ordination ſubſcribed by his Ordainers, and dated with the Year and Day of his Conſecration [*x*]. Third-

[*t*] Marca Diſſert. de Primat. n. 3. Albaſpin. Not. in Optat. Lib. 1. p. 121. Stillingfleet Hiſt. *of* Separ. Par. 3. §. 9. p. 253. Fell Not. in Con. Carth. ap. Cypr. p. 230. [*u*] Aug. Ep. 261.

[*w*] Con. Milev. in Cod. Can. Afr. c. 86. [*x*] Con. Milev. can. 14. Placuit ut quicunq; ab Epiſcopis ordinantur, Literas accipiant ab Ordinatoribus ſuis, manu eorum ſubſcriptas, continentes Conſulem & Diem, ut nulla altercatio de Poſterioribus vel Anterioribus oriatur.

ly,

ly, all Biſhops were to take place according to Seniority, and ſo ſit and vote, and have their Names ſubſcribed in Council; which was a Rule not only in *Africk* [y], but in all other Churches, being enacted by ſeveral [z] Councils, and inſerted into the Civil Law [a] by *Juſtinian* the Emperor. But they were the more nice in obſerving this in *Africk*, where the Primacy went by Seniority, leſt the neglect of it ſhould have bred Confuſion among them. Inſomuch that St. *Auſtin* [b] blames *Victorinus*, (who pretended to be Primate of *Numidia*) only becauſe in his *Tractoria*, or Letter of Summons to a Provincial Council, he wrote the Names of the *Numidian* Biſhops in a confuſed Order, and put *Auſtin*'s Name before many of his Seniors: Which was a thing, he ſays, equally Injurious to them, and Invidious to himſelf. So cautious was he of doing any thing that might ſeem to entrench upon this Rule, for fear of breeding Confuſion in the Government of their Churches.

Sect. 9.
Three ſorts of Honorary Primates, beſides the Primate in Power.

I muſt here take notice farther, that beſides the Primacy of Power, there was in moſt Provinces alſo a Primacy of Honour; whence ſome Biſhops had the Name and Title of Primates, who had not the Juriſdiction. And theſe were of three ſorts: 1. The *Primates Ævo*, the oldeſt Biſhop in each Province next to the Metropolitan. Theſe had no Power above others, except when the Metropolitan was ſomeway diſabled, or unqualified

1. Primates Ævo.

[y] Con. Milev. c. 13. Poſteriores Anterioribus deferant, &c. Vit. Fulgentii cap. 20. Inter Epiſcopos, tempore Ordinationis inferior, ultimus ſedebat. [z] Con. Bracar. 1. can. 24. Con. Tolet. 4. can. 3. Secundum Ordinationis ſuæ tempora reſideant. [a] Cod. Juſtin. Lib. 1. Tit. 4. c. 29. Epiſcopi tempore Ordinationis prælati, &c. [b] Aug. Ep. 217. ad Victorin.

for

for discharging his Office, by Irregularity or Suspension: Then his Power of course devolv'd to the Senior Bishop of the Province. And this, I conceive, was the reason why the Bishop of *Amastris* [c] presided in Council over the Bishops of *Pontus*, when yet *Heraclea*, and not *Amastris*, was the Metropolis of the Province.

Sect. 10.
2. *Titular Metropolitans.*

The 2*d*. sort of Honorary Primates were the Titular Metropolitans, which were the Bishops of such Cities as had the Name and Title of Civil Metropoles bestowed on them by some Emperor, without the Power and Privileges, which were still retained to the ancient Metropolis of the Province. Thus *Marcian* the Emperor dignified the City *Chalcedon* with the Title of a Metropolis, and the Honour was confirmed to the Bishop by the Council of *Chalcedon* [d] it self, only with a *Salvo Jure* to the Rights of *Nicomedia* the old Metropolis: From that time therefore the Bishop of *Chalcedon* stiled himself Metropolitan of *Bithynia*, as may be seen in the Acts [e] of the 6*th* General Council. The same Honour was done to the City and Bishop of *Nice*, in the Council of *Chalcedon* [f] likewise. So that here were three Metropolitans in one Province, but one only had the Power; the Privileges of the other two were only Honorary, to Sit and Vote in Council next to their Metropolitan. Yet this gave such Bishops an opportunity to exalt themselves, and sometimes they so far encroached upon the Rights of the first Metropolitan, as to draw off his Suffragans, and divide the Province with him. Thus it was with the Bishop of *Nice*, who before the

[c] Euseb. l. 5. c. 23. *Says he presided as the Senior Bishop,* ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προὔτάκτο. [d] Con. Chalced. Act. 6. T. 4. p. 612. [e] Con. 6. Gen. Act. 18. [f] Con. Chalced. Act. 13. p. 716.

time

time of the *6th* General Council, had got a Synod of Suffragans under him. For ſo *Photius* ſubſcribed himſelf in that Council [*g*] Biſhop of *Nice*, and Metropolitan of *Bithynia* for himſelf, and the Synod that was under him.

Sect. 11.

3. *The Biſhops of ſome Mother-Churches, which were honoured by ancient Cuſtom.*

Beſides theſe there were a third ſort of Primates, who though they were neitheir Biſhops of Titular Metropoles, nor the oldeſt Biſhops of the Province, yet took place of all the reſt, by a general Deference that was paid to them, out of regard to the Eminency of their See, being ſome Mother-Church, or particularly honoured by ancient Preſcription. This was the Caſe of the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. That City was no Metropolis of the Empire, but ſubject to *Cæſarea* the Metropolis of *Palæſtine*: Yet in regard that it was the Mother-Church of the World, this peculiar Honour was paid to it, That the Biſhop thereof was always next in Dignity to the Metropolitan of *Cæſarea*, and took place of all the other Biſhops of the Province: And this Privilege was confirmed to him by the *Nicene* Council [*h*], which made a Canon to this purpoſe: That whereas by ancient Cuſtom and Tradition, the Biſhop of *Ælia* had a particular Honour paid him, the ſame ſhould be continued to him, ſtill reſerving to the Metropolis the Dignity and Privilege which belonged to it. Some fondly imagine [*i*] that this Canon gave the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* Patriarchal Power; whereas it does not ſo much as make him a Metropolitan, but leaves him ſubject to the Metropolis of *Palæſtine*, which was *Cæſarea*, as St. *Jerom* [*k*] informs us, whoſe Words clear the Senſe of this Canon, and prove that the Biſhop

[*g*] Con. 6. Gen. Act 18 p 1080. [*h*] Con. Nic. can. 7. ἐχέτω δὲ ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ Μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος. [*i*] Sylvius Addit. ad Caranz. ſumm. Concil. [*k*] Jerom. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. Hoc ibi decernitur ut Palæſtinæ Metropolis Cæſarea ſit.

of *Jeruſalem* was no Metropolitan, nor Independent of his Metropolitan, as *Valeſius* [*l*] imagines, but had only the ſecond place of Honour aſſigned him next to his Metropolitan, which was that Honorary Primacy which the Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* had always enjoyed, becauſe, as the Council of *Conſtantinople* words it [*m*], *Jeruſalem* was the Mother of all other Churches.

Sect. 12. *The Offices of Metropolitans.* 1. *To ordain their Suffragan Biſhops.*

But leaving theſe Honorary Primates, who had little more than a Name, I am here to ſhew what were the Offices and Privileges of thoſe who were properly Metropolitans, and they were theſe that follow. Firſt, they were to regulate the Elections of all their Provincial Biſhops, and either ordain, or authorize the Ordination of them. No Biſhop was to be elected or ordained without their Conſent and Approbation: Otherwiſe the Canons pronounce both the Election and the Ordination null. The Κῦρος, or Ratification of all that is done, ſays the Council of *Nice* [*n*], belongs to the Metropolitan in every Province. And again, if any Biſhop is made without the conſent of the Metropolitan, this great Synod [*o*] pronounces ſuch an one to be no Biſhop, The ſame Rule is repeated in the Councils of *Antioch* [*p*], *Laodicea* [*q*], *Arles* [*r*], *Turin* [*s*], *Sardica* [*t*], *Epheſus* [*u*], and *Chalcedon* [*w*]. And whereas ſome pretend that the *African* Primates had not this

[*l*] Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. 5. 23. [*m*] Con. Conſtant. Ep. Synod. ad Damaſ. [*n*] Con. Nic. can 4.
[*o*] Ibid. can. 6. [*p*] Con. Antioch. can. 19.
[*q*] Con. Laodic. can. 12. [*r*] Con. Arelat. 2. can. 5, & 6. [*s*] Con. Taurin. can. 1. [*t*] Con. Sardic. can. 6. [*u*] Con. Epheſ. Decret de Epiſc. Cypr.
[*w*] Con. Chalced. Act. 13. It. can. 25.

Power,

Power, the contrary appears evidently from several Canons of their Councils. The second Council of *Carthage* [x] says, No one shall presume to ordain a Bishop without consulting the Primate of the Province, and taking his Precept, though many other Bishops should join with him. The third Council of *Carthage* requires but three Bishops to the Ordination of a Bishop, but then [y] they must be such as are expresly Authorized by the Metropolitan. And the fourth Council [z] requires either his Presence, or at least his Authority and Commission. Here a Primate and a Metropolitan are the same thing, *viz.* The Senior Bishop of the Province, who usually went to the Church, where the new Bishop was to be placed, and Consecrated him with his own Hands, as St. *Austin* and *Possidius* [a] testifie, who are good Witnesses of their Practice.

Sect. 13. *This Power continued to them after the setting up of Patriarchs.*

Nor was this Power at all infringed by setting up of Patriarchs above them For though the Metropolitans were then to be ordained by the Patriarchs, and obliged to attend on them for it, who before were ordained by their own Provincial Synod; yet still the Right of Ordaining their own Suffragans, was all along preserved to them, and expresly confirmed by the Council [b] of *Chalcedon*; nor do we ever find any Patriarch assuming this Power, except the Bishop of *Alexandria*, for a par-

[x] Con. Carth. 2. c. 12. Inconsulto Primate cujuslibet Provinciæ nemo præsumat, licet cum multis Episcopis, sine ejus Præcepto Episcopum ordinare. [y] Con. Carth. 3. c. 39. Non minus quam tres sufficiant, qui fuerint à Metropolitano directi ad ordinandum Episcopum. [z] Con Carth. 4. c. 1. Conventu totius Provinciæ Episcoporum, maximeq; Metropolitani vel Præsentia, vel Auctoritate ordinetur Episcopus.

[a] Aug. Ep. 261. Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 8.

[b] Con. Chalced. Act. 16. in fin.

ticular Reaſon, of which I ſhall give an Account in the following Chapter. §. 11.

Sect. 14. *Yet this Power not Arbitrary, but determined by the Major Vote of a Provincial Synod.*

But here I muſt obſerve, that this Power of Metropolitans was not Arbitrary: For though no Biſhop was to be elected or ordained without their Conſent, yet they had no Negative Voice in the Matter, but were to be determined and concluded by the Major Part of a Provincial Synod. For ſo the Council of *Arles* [c] decreed, That if there aroſe any Doubt or Heſitation betwixt the Parties, the Metropolitan ſhould ſide with the greater Number. And the Council of *Nice* [d] to the ſame purpoſe: If two or three out of a Contentious Humour ſhall oppoſe the common Election, duly and regularly made according to the Canons of the Church, in this caſe let the Majority of Voices prevail.

Sect. 15. *Metropolitans to be choſen and ordained by their own Provincial Synod.*

And the ſame Rule was to be obſerved in the Ordination of Metropolitans themſelves, who were to be choſen and conſecrated by their own Provincial Biſhops; who were not obliged to ſend for a Metropolitan out of another Province to do it, but they had Power to do it in their own Provincial Synod among themſelves. This St. *Auſtin* ſays was the Cuſtom of the Catholick Church, both in *Africk* and at *Rome*. And therefore when the *Donatiſts* objected againſt *Cæcilian* Primate of *Carthage*, that his Ordination was uncanonical, becauſe he had not ſent for the Neighbouring Primate of *Numidia* to come and Ordain him:

[c] Con. Arelat. 2. can. 5. Si inter Partes aliqua nata fuerit dubitatio, majori numero Metropolitanus in Electione conſentiat. [d] Con. Nic. can. 6.

His

His Anſwer was [e], That *Cæcilian* had no need of this; ſince the Cuſtom of the Catholick Church was otherwiſe, which was not to have the *Numidian* Biſhops to ordain the Biſhop of *Carthage*, but the Neighbouring Biſhops of the Province of *Carthage*: As it was not the Cuſtom at *Rome* to ſend for a Metropolitan out of another Province, to ordain the Biſhop of *Rome*, but he was always ordained by the Biſhop of *Oſtia*, a Neighbouring Biſhop of the ſame Province.

'Tis true there is a Canon in the Council [f] of *Sardica*, which orders the Biſhops of the next Province, as ſome interpret it, to be called in to the Ordination of a Metropolitan, τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς πλησιοχώρου ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους. But this perhaps may as well be rendered, The Neighbouring [g] Biſhops of the ſame Province; and ſince Cuſtom and the Practice of the Church, which is the beſt Interpreter of doubtful Canons, does manifeſtly favour this Senſe, there is ſome reaſon ſo to underſtand it. But however it be, here is no mention of one Metropolitan having a Right to ordain another. From which it appears, that in theſe times no Metropolitan was obliged to go or ſend out of his own Province, much leſs to *Rome*, for his Ordination; but all was to be done by his Suffragans in his own Church. Nor was any Biſhop obliged to go for Ordination to his Metropolitan's Church, but ordinarily the Metropolitan and the reſt of the Biſhops met Synodically in the

[e] Aug. Brevic. Collat. tert. die, c. 16. Non exſpectavit Cæcilianus ut Princeps à Principe ordinaretur; cum aliud habeat Eccleſiæ Catholicæ Conſuetudo, ut non Numidiæ, ſed propinquiores Epiſcopi Epiſcopum Eccleſiæ Carthaginis ordinent: Sicut nec Romanæ Eccleſiæ ordinat aliquis Epiſcopus Metropolitanus, ſed de proximo Oſtienſis Epiſcopus. [f] Con. Sard. can. 6.

[g] Harmenopulus *ſo underſtood it: For in his Epitome he thus words it*; Οἱ πλησιόχωροι τῆς ἐπαρχίας παρέσωσ. Vid. Harmen. Epit. Canon. ap. Leunclav. Jur. Gr. Rom. T. 1. p. 2.

vacant Church, and there elected and consecrated a new Bishop in the presence of the People, for whom they ordained him. This was the first part of the Metropolitan's Office.

Sect. 16. *The 2d Office of Metropolitans, to decide Controversies arising among their Provincial Bishops, and take Appeals from them.*

Their next Office was to preside over their Provincial Bishops, and if any Controversies arose among them, to interpose their Authority to end and decide them: As also to hear the Accusations of others, who complained of Injury done them by their own Bishops, from whom there was Liberty always to appeal to their Metropolitan. Thus in *Africk* it was ordained [*h*] by the Council of *Milevis*, That if two Bishops disputed about the Bounds of their Dioceses, the Metropolitan should appoint a Committee of Bishops to hear and determine their Controversy. If a Presbyter or Deacon was Excommunicated by his own Bishop, the Council of *Sardica* [*i*] allows him liberty to Appeal to the Metropolitan of his Province; or if he were absent, to the Metropolitan of the next Province, to desire a new hearing of his Cause. In such cases as these the Metropolitan had three ways of proceeding: Either 1st he was to appoint a select Number of Bishops to be Judges; which was the Practice of *Africk*, where such Judges were therefore called [*k*] *Judices Electi*, and their Number assigned to be Twelve [*l*], if a Bishop's Cause was to be tried before them. Or 2dly, he was to refer the matter to a Provincial Synod, which seems to have been the General Practice, when those called the Apostolical Canons

[*h*] Con. Milev. Can 21. Per Episcopos Judices Causa finiatur, sive quos eis Primates dederint, sive quos ipsi vicinos ex consultu Primatis delegerint. [*i*] Con. Sard. can. 14. [*k*] Con. Carth. 3. can 7. [*l*] Con. Carth. 1. can. 11. Episcopus à duodecim Consacerdotibus audiatur.

were

were made: One of which Orders [*m*], That when a Biſhop is accuſed, he ſhall be convened before a Synod of Biſhops. Another ſays [*n*], The Primate ſhall do nothing without the conſent of all the other Biſhops; ſo Concord will be preſerved, and God will be glorified. And another, Twice a Year let there be a Synod of Biſhops [*o*] to examine Doctrines of Religion, and terminate all Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies that may happen. But 3dly, by *Juſtinian's* Law [*p*] the Metropolitan has Power to hear Cauſes upon Appeal himſelf without a Synod: Yet whether he could proceed ſo far as to depoſe a Biſhop by his ſole Authority, is queſtioned: *Spalatenſis* [*q*] gives ſome Inſtances of Biſhops that were depoſed by their Metropolitans, but for ought that appears it was done in Synod: But whether it was, or was not, matters not much; for ſtill in all Caſes, by the ſame Law of *Juſtinian* [*r*] and the Canons, there lay an Appeal from the Metropolitan to a Provincial Synod, of which he was only the Preſident, or Moderator and Director of Buſineſs in it.

Sect. 17. *Their 3d Office to call Provincial Synods, which all Suffragans were obliged to attend.*

3. And this leads us to a third Office of the Metropolitans, which was to call Provincial Synods, and preſide in them. For ſince the Canons [*s*] appointed two Synods to be held ordinarily every Year in each Province (beſides ſuch as might be called upon extraordinary Occaſions) it was neceſſary ſome one ſhould be appointed to give notice of the Time and Place, and have Authority both to convocate and preſide in them. All things therefore relating to this

[*m*] Can. Apoſt. c 74. Con. Conſtant. 2. Gen. can. 6. [*n*] Ibid. c. 35. Con. Antioch can 9. [*o*] Ibid. c. 38. [*p*] Cod. Juſt. lib. 1. Tit. 4. c. 29. [*q*] Spalat. de Repub. Eccl. par. 1. l. 3. c. 7. n. 19. [*r*] Cod. Juſt. ibid. [*s*] Con. Nic. can. 5. Antioch. c. 20. Agathen. c. 35. Arelat. 2 c. 18. Can. Apoſt. c. 38.

Matter, were by common Consent put into the Primate's Power, whose Circular Letters (which sometimes are called *Synodicæ* and *Tractoriæ* [t], as the Emperors were called *Sacræ*) were a legal Summons, which no Bishop of the Province might disobey under pain of Suspension, or some such Canonical Censure, which is left to the Discretion [u] of the Metropolitan and the Council.

Sect. 18.

4. Metropolitans to publish Imperial Laws and Canons, visit Dioceses, and correct Abuses.

4. It belonged to Metropolitans to publish and disperse such Imperial Laws and Canons, as were either by Councils or Emperors made for the Common Good of the Church. This they are required to do by several Laws [w] both of the Church and State, the better to diffuse the Knowledge, and enforce the Practice of them. Nor were they only to disperse the Canons that were made, but to see that they were observed: Which gave them Right to Visit and Enquire into Neglects, Abuses, and Disorders committed by any Bishop throughout the whole Province. The Metropolitan in this respect is said to have the Care of the whole Province, by the Council [x] of *Antioch.* Not that this gave him Power to Officiate in any other Bishop's Church, or perform such Acts as the Bishop himself might perform alone, such as the Ordaining of Presbyters and Deacons, and the like; which are Specialties of every Bishop, reserved to them by the same Council: But in case of Omission or Scandalous Neglect, the Bishop of the Metropolis was to manifest his Care with the Advice of the rest of his Brethren.

---

[t] Aug. Ep. 217. ad Victorin. Tractoria ad me quinto Idus Novembris venit, *&c.* [u] Con. Chalced. can. 19. Con. Carth. 4. can. 21. Theodoret. Ep. 81. [w] Justin. Novel. 6, & 42. [x] Con. Antioch. can. 9. Τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας,

5. In

Sect. 19

5. Biſhops not to travel without the Letters of their Metropolitan.

5. In *Africk* all Biſhops paid a peculiar Deference to the Primate in taking his Licenſe to Travel, whenever they were called into a Foreign Country upon extraordinary Occaſions. This was expreſly provided by a Canon of the 3d Council of *Carthage* [*y*], That no Biſhop ſhould go beyond Sea without conſulting his Primate, and taking his *Formatæ*, or Letters of Commendation. Nor was this ſo peculiar to *Africk*, but that we may meet with the ſame Rule and Practice in other Places, even as low as the time of *Gregory* the Great, who in one of his Epiſtles [*z*], gives the ſame Direction to ſome Biſhops in reference to their Metropolitan, That they ſhould not travel upon urgent Occaſion, without his Letters of Conceſſion.

Sect. 20.

6. Metropolitans to take care of vacant Sees within their Province.

6. It belonged to Metropolitans to take care of all vacant Sees within their Province; to adminiſter the Affairs of the Church during the Vacancy, to ſecure the Revenues of the Biſhoprick, and procure a ſpeedy Election of a new Biſhop. In *Africk* the Primate commonly appointed one of the Neighbouring Biſhops to be his Vicegerent in ſuch a Caſe, whom therefore the Canons (as has been obſerved before) call an Interventor [*a*]. The Council of *Riez* [*b*] in *France* in like manner puts the Adminiſtration of a vacant See into the hands of a Neighbouring Biſhop, under the Inſpection of the Metropolitan. And the Council of *Valentia* [*c*] in *Spain* Authorizes the Metropolitan to puniſh Purloi-

[*y*] Con. Carth. 3. can. 28. Ut Epiſcopi trans mare non proficiſcantur, niſi conſulto Primæ Sedis Epiſcopo, *&c.* [*z*] Greg. M. Ep. 8. lib. 7. [*a*] Con. Carth. 5. can. 8. [*b*] Con. Reienſ. can. 5, & 6. [*c*] Con. Valent. can. 2.

ners

ners of the Revenues in the Vacancy, and to ſend an Adminiſtrator till a new Biſhop is choſen. By a Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon* [*d*], the Care of the Revenues of the Church is committed to the Steward of the Church, the *Oeconomus*; but the Care of ſupplying the vacant See with a new Biſhop within Three Months, is the Buſineſs of the Metropolitan.

Sect. 21. *7. Metropolitans to Calculate the time of* Eaſter.

7. It belonged to the Metropolitan yearly to review the Calculation of the time of *Eaſter*, and give notice to his Suffragans of it. The Care of Compoſing the Cycle indeed was by the *Nicene* Fathers particularly committed [*e*] to the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, as Pope *Leo* and others inform us: And he was to give notice to other Churches: But due Care was not always taken in this matter, and therefore the Metropolitan in every Province was concerned to ſettle the time, and acquaint the whole Province with it. As we find St. *Ambroſe* [*f*] did for the Province of *Milan*; and the Biſhop of *Carthage* [*g*] for the Province of *Africk*: And the *Spaniſh* Councils [*h*] order their Metropolitans firſt to concert the matter among themſelves, and then communicate it to their Comprovincials.

Sect. 22. *How the Power of Metropolitans grew in After-Ages.*

Some later Canons [*i*] make it the Privilege of Metropolitans to Conſecrate all Churches throughout the Province. But I have ſhewed before that this was Originally the Privilege of every Biſhop in his own Dioceſe; and being a private Act, which only concerned his own Church, and not the whole Province,

[*d*] Con. Chalced. c. 25. [*e*] Leo. Ep. 62. al. 70. ad Marcian. Imper. [*f*] Ambroſ. Ep. 83. ad. Epiſc. per Æmyliam. [*g*] Con. Carth. 3. can. 1, & 41. [*h*] Con. Bracar. 2. can. 9. Con. Tolet. 4. can. 4. [*i*] Gelaſ. Ep. 1. c. 4. Montan. Tolet. Ep. ad Palentinos ap. Blondel. Apol. p. 150.

the

the Metropolitan was to have no hand in it, no more than in the Conſecration of Presbyters and Deacons, by the 9*th* Canon of the Council of *Antioch*. Other Canons [*k*] bind the whole Province to follow the Forms and Rites of Divine Service us'd in the Metropolitan Church: But I have obſerved before, that anciently every Biſhop had Liberty to preſcribe for his own Dioceſe, and was under no Limitation as to this Matter, unleſs it were the Order of a Provincial Council.

Sect. 23. *The Primate of* Alexandria *had the greateſt Power of any other.*

By this we ſee that the Power of Metropolitans in ſome Places exceeded others. And I muſt here obſerve, that the Primate of *Alexandria* was the greateſt Metropolitan in the World, both for the Abſoluteneſs of his Power, and the Extent of his Juriſdiction. For he was not Metropolitan of a ſingle Province, but of all the Provinces of *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Pentapolis*, in which there were at leaſt Six large Provinces, out of which ſometimes above an Hundred Biſhops were called to a Provincial Council. *Alexander* ſummon'd near that Number to the Condemnation of *Arius* [*l*] before the Council of *Nice*. And *Athanaſius* [*m*] ſpeaks of the ſame Number meeting at other times: Particularly the Council of *Alexandria*, *Ann.* 339, which heard and juſtified the Cauſe of *Athanaſius* after his Return from his Baniſhment, had almoſt an Hundred Biſhops in it; which was above 30 more than the Biſhop of *Rome's Libra*, which was but Sixty nine. Nor was the Primate of *Alexandria* s Power leſs than the Extent of his Juriſdiction: For he not only ordained all his Suffragan

[*k*] Concil. Gerundenſ. can. 1. Con. Epaun. can. 27. Con. Toſet. 11. can. 3. [*l*] Alexand. Ep. Encycl. ap. Socrat. lib 1. c. 6. [*m*] Athan. Apol. 2. p. 720. Con. Alexandr. Ep. Encycl. Con. T. 2. p. 533.

Biſhops,

Biſhops, but had Liberty to ordain Presbyters and Deacons in all Churches throughout the whole Diſtrict. Mr. *Baſnage* [n] and *Launoy* will have it that he had the ſole Power of Ordaining, and that not ſo much as a Presbyter or Deacon could be Ordained without him. *Valeſius* [o] thinks his Privilege was rather that he might Ordain, if he pleaſed; but not that he had the ſole Power of Ordaining Presbyters and Deacons. But either way it was a great Privilege, and peculiar to the Biſhop of *Alexandria*: For no other Metropolitan pretended to the like Power beſides himſelf.

Sect. 24. *All Metropolitans called* Apoſtolici, *and their Sees* Sedes Apoſtolicæ.

I have but one thing more to obſerve concerning Metropolitans, which is, that they were anciently all dignified with the Name *Apoſtolici*; which was then no peculiar Title of the Biſhop of *Rome*. For Pope *Siricius* himſelf gives all Primates [p] this Appellation: And it continued to be their Title to the Days of *Alcuin*, who ſpeaking of the Election of Biſhops, ſays [q], when the Clergy and People have choſen one, they draw up an Inſtrument, and go with their Elect to the *Apoſtolicus*: By whom he means not the Pope, but the Primate or Metropolitan of every Province who had the Right and Power of Conſecration.

[n] Baſnag. Exerc. in Baron. p. 307. & Launoy, Ibid.

[o] Valeſ. obſerv. in Socrat. lib. 3. [p] Siric. Ep. 4. c. 1. Ut extra conſcientiam ſedis Apoſtolicæ, id eſt, Primatis, nemo audeat ordinare. [q] Alcuin. de Div. Offic. c. 36. Cum Epiſcopus Civitatis fuerit defunctus, eligitur alius à Clero ſeu Populo, fitq; Decretum ab illis, & veniunt ad Apoſtolicum cum ſuo Electo.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Of Patriarchs.

Sect. 1. *Patriarchs anciently called Archbiſhops.*

NExt in order to the Metropolitans or Primates, were the Patriarchs; or, as they were at firſt called, Archbiſhops and Exarchs of the Dioceſe. For though now an Archbiſhop and a Metropolitan be generally taken for the ſame, to wit, the Primate of a ſingle Province; yet anciently the Name Archbiſhop was a more extenſive Title, and ſcarce given to any but thoſe whoſe Juriſdiction extended over a whole Imperial Dioceſe, as the Biſhops of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. That this was ſo, appears evidently from one of *Juſtinian*'s Novels, where erecting the Biſhoprick of *Juſtiniana Prima* into a Patriarchal See, he ſays, Our Pleaſure is, that the Biſhop of *Juſtiniana* ſhall not only be a Metropolitan [*r*], but an Archbiſhop. Here the Names are clearly diſtinguiſhed, and an Archbiſhop reckoned Superior to a Metropolitan. And hence it was, that after the ſetting up of Patriarchal Power, the Name Archbiſhop was appropriated to the Patriarchs. *Liberatus* [*s*] gives all the Patriarchs this Title of Archbiſhops. So does the Council of *Chalcedon* frequently, ſpeaking of the Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople* [*t*], under the Name of Archbiſhops alſo.

[*r*] Juſtin. Novel. 11. Volumus ut non ſolum Metropolitanus, ſed etiam Archiepiſcopus fiat. [*s*] Liberat. Breviar. c. 17. [*t*] Con. Chalced. Act. 16. It. Act. 4 & Can. 30.

Theſe

Sect. 2. *And Exarchs of the Dioceſe.*

Theſe were otherwiſe called Ἔξαρχοι τῆς διοικήσεως, Exarchs of the Dioceſe, to diſtinguiſh them from the Ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας, the Exarchs of a ſingle Province, which were only Metropolitans. Thus *Domnus* Biſhop of *Antioch* is ſtiled Exarch of the Eaſtern [u] Dioceſe, by the Councils of *Antioch* and *Chalcedon*. And in the Subſcriptions of the *6th* General Council at *Conſtantinople*, *Theodore* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, ſubſcribes himſelf both Metropolitan of *Epheſus* [w], and Exarch of the *Aſiatick* Dioceſe: As alſo *Philalethes* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* ſtiles himſelf Exarch of the *Pontick* Dioceſe. Which ſhews, that as the Exarch of a Province is a Metropolitan, ſo the Exarch of a Dioceſe is a Patriarch in the ancient Language of the Church. And by this we underſtand the meaning of the *9th* and *17th* Canons of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which allow of Appeals from the Metropolitan to the Exarch of the Dioceſe.

Sect. 3. *Salmaſius's miſtake about the firſt uſe of the Name Patriarch.*

As to the Name Patriarch, there is ſome Diſpute among Learned Men, when firſt it began to be uſed as an Appropriate Title of any Chriſtian Biſhops. *Salmaſius* [x] and ſome others are of Opinion, that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* had this Title from the time of the Emperor *Hadrian*, which was in the beginning of the *2d* Century. Their Reaſon is, becauſe that Emperor in an Epiſtle mentioned by *Vopiſcus*, ſpeaks of a Patriarch at *Alexandria*. But the Patriarch there ſpoken of, was not any Chriſtian, but a *Jewiſh* Patriarch; as may appear from *Hadrian's* Words, and the Character which he gives

[u] Con. Antioch. in Act. 14. Con. Chalced. Gen. Act. 18. Con. Tom. 6. p. 1077. & 1080. de Primat. c. 4. p. 44. It. not. in Vopiſcum.

[w] Con. 6.

[x] Salmaſ.

[y] of

[y] of him. For he ſays, he was one who was compelled to Worſhip both Chriſt and *Serapis*: Which agrees very well to the Character of a *Jewiſh* Patriarch, who neither acknowledged the Heathen, nor the Chriſtian Religion, and therefore needed as much Compulſion to bring him to worſhip Chriſt, as *Serapis*; but it does not at all agree to the Character of a Chriſtian Biſhop, who, however he might need force to compel him to worſhip *Serapis*, yet muſt be ſuppoſed willing of his own accord to worſhip Chriſt. Beſides, the Patriarch which the Emperor ſpeaks of was one who came only Occaſionally into *Egypt* out of another Country; which cannot be ſaid of the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, who had his fixed and continual Reſidence there: But it ſuits exactly the State and Condition of the *Jewiſh* Patriarch, who reſided at *Tiberias* in *Palæſtine*, and came but accidentally, or at ſome certain times, into *Egypt*. Theſe and the like Reaſons make others conclude againſt *Salmaſius*, that whoever is meant, it is not any Chriſtian Patriarch that is here ſpoken of. *Baronius* [z] fancies it was the Heathen Pontifex, or High-Prieſt of *Egypt*: But the ſame Reaſons will hold againſt his Opinion as againſt the other: For the High-Prieſt of *Egypt* lived in *Egypt*, and needed no Compulſion to worſhip *Serapis*, as this Patriarch did. So that it muſt be the *Jewiſh* Patriarch, and no other, which *Hadrian* ſpeaks of, as Mr. *Baſnage* [a] and Biſhop *Pearſon*, with ſome others have obſerved.

[y] Hadrian. Epiſt. ap. Vopiſcum Vit. Saturnin. Illi qui Serapin colunt, Chriſtiani ſunt. Et devoti ſunt Serapi, qui ſe Chriſti Epiſcopos dicunt. Nemo illic Archiſynagogus Judæorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Chriſtianorum Presbyter, non Mathematicus, non Aruſpex, non Aliptes. Ille ipſe Patriarcha, quum Ægyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Chriſtum. [z] Baron. Annal. Tom. 2. an. 112. [a] Baſnag. Exercit. Hiſtor. p. 284. Pearſon. Vindic. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 11. p. 328. Suicer. Theſaur. Eccleſ. Verbo πατριάρχης. Cave, Anc. Chur. Gov. p. 153.

Theſe

Sect. 4. *Of the* Jewiſh *Patriarchs, their firſt Riſe, Duration, and Extinction.*

Theſe *Jewiſh* Patriarchs, from whom, as is generally agreed, the Chriſtian Patriarchs borrowed their Names, were a ſort of Governors among the *Jews* ſet up upon the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*; one of which had his Reſidence at *Tiberias*, and another at *Babylon*, who were the Heads of the *Jews* diſperſed throughout the *Roman* and the *Perſian* Empire. Of theſe there is frequent mention made in the ancient Writers of the Church, [*b*] *Origen*, [*c*] *Epiphanius*, [*d*] *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, [*e*] *Theodoret*, and many others. They continued in great Power and Dignity till the latter end of the 4*th* Century, about which time their Order ceaſed. For *Theodoret* ſays expreſly, that long before his time their Government was wholly aboliſhed: And one of the Laws of the younger *Theodoſius*, *An.* 429. ſpeaks [*f*] of them as then extinct.

Sect. 5. *Of the Patriarchs among the* Montaniſts.

Much about the ſame time the *Montaniſts*, or *Cataphrygian* Hereticks, had an Order of Men among them, which they called Patriarchs, and another which they called *Cenones*, both which were Superior to their Biſhops, and as it ſhould ſeem, Diſtinct Orders from them: For St. *Jerom* [*g*] charges it on them as a Crime, that they thruſt down the Order of Biſhops, who were the Apoſtles Succeſſors, and ſet up an Order of Patriarchs, and an Order of *Cenones* among them.

[*b*] Orig. περὶ ἀρχῶν, l. 4. c. 1. [*c*] Epiphan. Hær. 30. [*d*] Cyr. Catech. 12. n 7. [*e*] Theodor. Dial. 1. [*f*] Cod. Theod. lib. 16. Tit. 8. de Jud. l. 29. [*g*] Jerom. Ep. 54. ad Marcel. adv. Montan. T. 2. p. 128. Apud nos Apoſtolorum locum Epiſcopi tenent; apud eos Epiſcopus tertius eſt. Habent enim primos de Pepuza Phrygiæ Patriarchas: Secundos quos appellant Cenones: Atque ita in tertium, id eſt, pene ultimum locum, Epiſcopi devolvuntur.

Which

Which makes ſome Learned [*b*] Men think, that when St. *Jerom* wrote that againſt the *Montaniſts*, the Name *Patriarch* was not as yet adopted into the Church, though the Power was, under another Name.

Sect. 6. *The Name Patriarch firſt uſed by* Socrates *and the Council of* Chalcedon.

Indeed the firſt time we meet with the Name Patriarch given to any Biſhop by any Publick Authority of the Church, is in the Council of *Chalcedon*, which mentions [*i*] the moſt Holy Patriarchs of every Dioceſe, and particularly *Leo* Patriarch [*k*] of Great *Rome*. *Richerius*, who has written accurately about the Councils, can trace the Name no higher [*l*]. Among Private Authors the firſt that mentions Patriarchs by Name is *Socrates* [*m*], who wrote his Hiſtory about the Year 440, Eleven Years before the Council of *Chalcedon*. By what he ſays, it appears that during the Interval between the General Council of *Conſtantinople*, *Ann.* 381. and that of *Chalcedon*, the Name Patriarch began to be an appropriate Title of ſome eminent Biſhops in the Church. For ſpeaking of the Fathers at *Conſtantinople*, he ſays, They conſtituted Patriarchs, dividing the Provinces among them. *Valeſius* [*n*] and Dr. *Cave* [*o*] think *Socrates* ſpeaks not of true and proper Patriarchs, but only of extraordinary Legates, or Pro-tempore Commiſſioners, appointed by the Council to judge who were fit to be received to Catholick Communion in the ſeveral Dioceſes that were allotted them. But all others underſtand him in the proper Senſe, be-

[*b*] Baſnag. Exercit. Hiſtor. p. 285. Hinc colligi poſſit, priſcis temporibus nondum Epiſcopis inſignioribus affixum fuiſſe Nomen Patriarchæ. [*i*] Con Chalced. Act. 2 p. 338. ὁσιώτατοι πατριάρχαι ἑκάστης. [*k*] Act. 3 p. 395. [*l*] Rich. Hiſt. Concil. Tom. 1. c. 2. n. 11. Nomen Patriarcharum primum quod ſciam uſurpatum in Synodo Chalcedonenſi [*m*] Socrat. H. E. l. 5. c. 8. [*n*] Valeſ. Annot. in Socrat. [*o*] Anc. Ch. Gov. p. 147.

cauſe by this time Patriarchal Power was ſettled in all the Dioceſes of the *Roman* Empire.

Sect. 7.
Four different Opinions concerning the firſt Riſe of Patriarchal Power.

But though the Name of Patriarchs came not into the Church till about the time of *Socrates*, yet the Power it ſelf, as is agreed on all hands, was much earlier; though where preciſely to fix the *Epocha*, and date its Riſe, is not ſo eaſy to determine. Some carry it as high as the Apoſtles, and derive it, as they do the Popes Supremacy, from St. *Peter*. So [p] *Baronius*, who is followed by the moſt eminent Writers of his own Communion, *de Marca*, *Valeſius*, *Richerius*, *Pagius*, and *Schelſtrate*. Others juſtly reject this, as founded upon no good Authority, nor evidenced by any *Genuine* Records of the ancient Church, but only the Spurious Epiſtles of the firſt Popes; and reckon the firſt riſe of Patriarchs to have been after the Apoſtolical Age, and ſome time before the Council of *Nice*. This is the Opinion of *Spalatenſis* [q], and Mr. *Brerewood*. The 3*d* Opinion is that of *Balzamon* [r] and other Modern *Greeks*, that Patriarchs were firſt inſtituted by the Council of *Nice*: And this ſeems to be favoured by St. *Jerom*: For in his Epiſtle to *Pammachius*, writing againſt the Errors of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, he ſays, it was decreed in the Council of *Nice*, [s] that *Cæſarea* ſhould be the Metropolis of *Palæſtine*, and *Antioch* the Metropolis of the whole *Eaſt*. There-

[p] Baron. Annal. Tom. 1. an. 39. n. 16. Pet. de Marca de Concord. T. 1. lib. 1. c. 3. n. 5. Valeſ. Obſerv. Eccleſ. lib. 3. Richer. Hiſt. Concil. Tom. 1. c. 1. n. 14. Ant. Pag. Critic. an. 37. n. 9.

[q] Spalat. de Repub. Par. 1. l. 3. c. 12. n. 21. Brerewood of Patriar. Gov. Q. 1. [r] Balzam. in Can. 6. Con. Nic. [s] Hieron. Ep. 61. Tom. 2. p. 178. Ad Alexandrinum Epiſcopum Palæſtina quid pertinet? Ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæſtinæ Metropolis Cæſarea ſit & totius Orientis Antiochia. Aut igitur ad Cæſarienſem Epiſcopum referre debueras; — Aut ſi procul expetendum Judicium erat, Antiochiam potius Literæ dirigendæ.

fore

fore the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* muſt either Appeal to the Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, as his Immediate Metropolitan, or to the Biſhop of *Antioch*, as Metropolitan of the *Eaſt*. But if I rightly underſtand St. *Jerom*, he does not mean (as ſome miſtake him) that Patriarchs were firſt ſet up by the Council of *Nice*: For then Metropolitans muſt be ſo too; ſince he ſays the ſame of them, which yet every one knows were in the Church long before the Council of *Nice*. His meaning then muſt be, that both Metropolitans of Provinces, and Metropolitans of Dioceſes were in being before the Council of *Nice*, and only received Confirmation, or a Canonical Eſtabliſhment from it. And indeed it is evident, that the *Nicene* Fathers made no Alteration in theſe Matters, but only confirmed the ancient Rights of the Biſhops of Principal Cities, as they found them authorized by Cuſtom before. For the words [*t*] they uſe are, τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, "Let ancient Cuſtom ſtill take place; "ſo as in *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis*, the Biſhop of "*Alexandria* ſhall have Power over all; becauſe ſuch "alſo is the Cuſtom of the Biſhop of *Rome*. And "accordingly in *Antioch*, and in other Provinces, "let the Privileges be preſerved to the Churches.

Here it is plain, that no new Power is given to any Biſhops, but only what ancient Cuſtom and Practice had aſſigned them. So that either Patriarchs were ſet up by Cuſtom before the [*u*] Council of *Nice*, and confirmed by the Council, as St. *Jerom* thinks; or elſe not introduced till afterwards. This laſt Opinion (notwithſtanding what St. *Jerom* ſays) is embraced by the famous Mr. *Launoy* [*w*], Mr. *Baſnage* [*x*], Dr. *Beverege* [*y*], and Dr. *Cave* [*z*], who

[*t*] Con. Nic. can. 6. [*u*] So Du Pin Bibliothec. Vol. 2. p. 252. It. de Antiq. Eccl. Diſciplin. Diſſert. 1. Sect. 11. p. 35. [*w*] Launoy, de Rect. Interpr. Can. 6. Con. Nic. [*x*] Baſnag. Exercit. Hiſtor. p. 307. [*y*] Bevereg. Not. in Can. 2. Con. Conſtant. [*z*] Cave. Anc. Ch Gov. c. 2, & 4.

think that Patriarchal Power was not confirmed by the *Nicene* Canon, nor known in the Church till about the time of the 2*d* General Council of *Constantinople*, Ann. 381.

Sect. 8. *The Opinion of* Spalatensis *and St.* Jerom *preferred.*

In a Matter so obscure, and so variously controverted among Learned Men, it is not easy to determine where the Right lies. Patriarchal Power was not set up at one and the same time in all Places. *Alexandria* and *Antioch* were as early as any, and the Bishop of *Alexandria* before the Council of *Nice* had all *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis* under his Jurisdiction, as appears from the *Nicene* Canons. This was the *Diœcesis Ægyptiaca*, which consisted of six large Provinces, four in *Egypt*, viz. *Thebais*, *Arcadia*, *Augustanica*, and *Ægyptus* properly so called, *Libya* Inferior, and *Libya* Superior, which is *Pentapolis*. As all these were subject to the *Præfectus Augustalis* of *Egypt*, so they were likewise under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Alexandria*. So that he was not only a Metropolitan of a single Province, but of six Provinces joined in one Diocese. But now the Question is, whether at this time he had any Metropolitans under him? For if he had, then he was properly a Patriarch at the time of the *Nicene* Council. As to this I can only say, that *Epiphanius* and *Synesius* do expressly mention Archbishops and Metropolitans under the Archbishop of *Alexandria*, in the time of *Athanasius* and *Alexander* his Predecessor, who were both present in the Council of *Nice*. But whether they mean Metropolitans in the proper Sense, or only Coadjutors to the Archbishop of *Alexandria*, I cannot yet determine. I will recite the Passages, and leave the Curious and the Learned to make farther Enquiry. *Synesius* says, The Great *Athanasius* seeing the Church of *Ptolemais* had need of a Bishop that was able to cherish and augment the

the ſmall Sparks of true Religion, which was then in a dwindling Condition there; and finding *Siderius* Biſhop of *Palæbiſca* a Man fit for great Buſineſs; he commanded him to remove [*a*] thence to *Ptolemais*, to govern the Metropolitan Church there. And *Epiphanius* [*b*] ſpeaking of *Meletius*, the Author of the *Meletian* Schiſm before the Council of *Nice*, ſays expreſly, "He was an Archbiſhop in *Egypt*, under "*Alexander* Archbiſhop of *Alexandria*, to whom he "gave the firſt Information againſt *Arius*. This agrees with what he ſays of him in another place [*c*], "That he was Chief of the *Egyptian* Biſhops, and "next in Order to *Peter* in the Archbiſhoprick, be-"ing his Aſſiſtant, and adminiſtring Eccleſiaſtical "Affairs under him. For there the Cuſtom is, for "the Archbiſhop of *Alexandria* to have the ordering "of Eccleſiaſtical Matters throughout all *Egypt*, *The-*"*bais*, *Mareotes*, *Libya*, *Ammoniaca*, *Mareotis*, and "*Pentapolis*. So that as the Biſhop of *Alexandria* had ſix Provinces under him, he ſeems alſo to have had Subordinate Metropolitans or Archbiſhops under him likewiſe, as the Archbiſhop of *Lycopolis* in *Thebais*, the Metropolitan of *Ptolemais* in *Pentapolis*. And if theſe were properly Metropolitans, He muſt be a Patriarch, under the Name of Metropolitan of the whole *Egyptian* Dioceſe, as they were Metropolitans of their reſpective Provinces: Which is the thing that St. *Jerom* aſſerts in reference to *Cæſarea* and *Antioch*, that the one was the Metropolis of *Paleſtine*, and the other the Metropolis of the Oriental Dio-

[*a*] Syneſ. Ep. 67. ad Theoph. p. 231. Πάμμεγαν Ἀθανάσιον, ---τὸ ἀνδρεῖον τοῦτον, ὡς μείζοσι πράγμασιν ὁπτήδειον, ἐμοὶ διαβῆναι κελεῦσαι, τὴν Πτολεμαΐδα ἐκκλησίαν ὁπτερεπεύοντα. [*b*] Epiphan. Hær. 69 n. 3. Ὁ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Μελήτιος ὁ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον, ὑπὸ ὃν χειροτονίαν Ἀλεξάνδρου. [*c*] Hær. 68. Meletian. n. 1. Ὁ Μελήτιος πρῶτος κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον πεφήκων, καὶ δευτερεύων τῷ Πέτρῳ κατὰ τὴν Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν, ὡς δι' ἀντιλήψεως αὐτῷ χάριν, &c.

ceſe; and this from ancient Cuſtom, ratified and confirmed by the Council of *Nice*.

Sect. 9. *Patriarchal Power eſtabliſhed in three General Councils ſucceſſively, viz.* Conſtantinople, Epheſus, *and* Chalcedon.

But however this be (for I determine nothing poſitively in this Matter) the next Age affords us very pregnant Proofs of the Eſtabliſhment and Growth of Patriarchal Power. The General Council of *Conſtantinople* [*d*], *An.* 381, has a Canon to fix the Limits of the ſeveral Dioceſes; So that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* ſhould only adminiſter the Affairs of the *Egyptian* Dioceſe: The Biſhops of the *Eaſt*, the *Eaſtern* Dioceſe, reſerving the Privileges granted by the Council of *Nice* to the Church of *Antioch*: The Biſhops of the *Aſiatick* Dioceſe, the *Aſiatick* Churches only: Thoſe of the *Pontick* Dioceſe, the *Pontick* Churches: And thoſe of the *Thracian* Dioceſe, the *Thracian* Churches only.

Theodoret [*e*] ſpeaking of this Council, ſays, They divided the Dioceſes, and aſſigned every Dioceſe its proper Limits and Juriſdiction. And *Socrates* [*f*] more expreſly, "That they conſtituted Patriarchs, "and diſtributed the Provinces, ſo that no Biſhops "ſhould meddle with the Affairs of another Dioceſe, "as was uſed to be done in times of Perſecution. "*Nectarius* was allotted *Conſtantinople* and *Thrace*; "*Helladius*, St. *Baſil*'s Succeſſor, the *Pontick* Dio"ceſe, *&c.*

About Fifty Years after this, *An.* 431, the 3*d* General Council was held at *Epheſus*, where we find the Biſhop of *Antioch* laying claim to the Power of Ordinations in the Province of *Cyprus*: But this proving to be an unjuſt Claim, the Council made a Decree in favour of the *Cyprian* Biſhops, exempting

[*d*] Con. C. Pol. Can. 2. [*e*] Theod. Ep. 86. ad Flav. T. 3. P. 963. [*f*] Socrat. H. E. lib. 5. c. 8. πατριάρχας καθέσης, *&c.*

them

them from the Juriſdiction of *Antioch*; becauſe by ancient Cuſtom they always were exempt: And it is added [*g*] "That the ſame Rule ſhould be ob-"ſerved in all Dioceſes and Provinces, That no Bi-"ſhop ſhould ſeize upon any Province, which did "not anciently belong to his Juriſdiction. This plainly implies, that the Biſhop of *Antioch* had then ſeveral Provinces, or a whole Dioceſe, under his Power; which was confirmed to him by the Council, and he was only denied Juriſdiction over the Province of *Cyprus*, becauſe of ancient Right it did not belong to him.

About 18 Years after this, *Theodoſius* Junior, and *Valentinian* called the 2*d* Council of *Epheſus*, *An.* 449. And in the Letter of Summons to *Dioſcorus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, they give him Orders to bring ten Metropolitans [*h*] of his Dioceſe with him. This is noted by *Liberatus* in his Breviary, and the Letter is ſtill extant [*i*] in the Council of *Chalcedon*; by which it appears, that at this time the Archbiſhop of *Alexandria* had a great number of Metropolitans, within the *Egyptian* Dioceſe, under his Juriſdiction. So that though there be ſome Diſpute concerning the firſt Riſe and Original of Patriarchal Power: Yet there remains no manner of Doubt, but that it was come to its full Height and Eſtabliſhment in the time of the General Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*.

Sect. 10. *The Power of Patriarchs not exactly the ſame in all Churches.*

Therefore the next Enquiry is into the Rights and Privileges of theſe Patriarchs. And here it is to be nicely obſerved, that the Power of Patriarchs was not one and the

[*g*] Con. Epheſ. 1. Act. 7. Decret. de Epiſc. Cypr. [*h*] Liberat. Breviar. c. 12. Imperator dirigens Sacram Dioſcoro in Alexandriam, præcepit, ut cum decem Metropolitanis Epiſcopis, quos voluiſſet, ipſe eligeret, & veniret Epheſum.

[*i*] Con. Chalced. Act. 1. C. T. 4. p. 100.

The Patriarch of Conſtantinople *had ſome peculiar Privileges.*

ſame preciſely in all Churches, but differed according to the different Cuſtoms of Places and Countries, or according as it was the Pleaſure of Kings or Councils to beſtow greater Privileges on them. The Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, when he was firſt advanced by the 2*d* General Council, had only the ſingle Dioceſe of *Thrace* aſſigned him [*k*] for the exerciſe of his Juriſdiction: But in the next Age he was grown to be a ſort of Patriarch over the Patriarchs of *Epheſus* and *Cæſarea* in the *Aſiatick* and *Pontick* Dioceſes, by the voluntary Conſent of thoſe two Exarchs (no doubt) at firſt, paying a Deference to the Exarch of the Royal City; which advancing into a Cuſtom, was afterwards confirmed by Canon in the Council of *Chalcedon*. In the 16th Seſſion of that Council there is a long Debate about this Matter, the Popes Legates warmly ſtickling againſt it: But all the Metropolitans of the two Dioceſes of *Aſia* and *Pontus* then in Council, together with *Thalaſſius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and Exarch of the *Pontick* Dioceſe, with one Voice declaring, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* had by long Cuſtom and Preſcription enjoyed the Privilege of Ordaining Metropolitans in thoſe two Dioceſes, as well as that of *Thrace*; it was decreed, that this Privilege ſhould be continued to him, notwithſtanding the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Interceſſion againſt it [*l*]. Alſo by two Canons of that Council he is allowed to receive Appeals [*m*] from the Exarchs of thoſe Dioceſes, becauſe his Throne was in the Royal City. And in ſuch parts of thoſe Dioceſes, as were chiefly in the hands of *Barbarians*, he is authorized by another Canon [*u*] to ordain all

[*k*] Con. Conſt. 1. Can. 2. 28. & Act. 16. per Tot.
[*n*] Con. Chal. Can. 28.
[*l*] Con. Chalced. Can.
[*m*] Ibid. Can. 9, & 17.

the

the Biſhops, which in other Parts was the ſole Privilege of the Metropolitans. *Theodoret* [o] obſerves even of *Chryſoſtom* himſelf before the Council of *Chalcedon*, that he exerciſed this Power over all the three Dioceſes. For he ſays, "His Care extended not only "over *Conſtantinople* and *Thrace*, which conſiſted of "ſix Provinces, but over *Aſia* and *Pontus*, each of "which had Eleven Civil *Prætors* in them. We are not therefore to take an Eſtimate of Patriarchal Power from the growing Greatneſs of *Conſtantinople*, but to diſtinguiſh the peculiar Privileges of ſome Patriarchs above others, which is the only way to underſtand the Power of each.

Sect. 11. *The Patriarch of* Alexandria *had alſo Privileges peculiar to himſelf.*

For the Patriarch of *Alexandria* had alſo ſome Prerogatives, which no other Patriarch beſides himſelf enjoyed. Such was the Right of Conſecrating and Approving every ſingle Biſhop throughout all the Provinces of his Dioceſe. This Privilege was not allowed even to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*: For the Council of *Chalcedon*, in the very ſame place where they give him Power to conſecrate the Metropolitans of three whole Dioceſes, deny him the Privilege of Conſecrating the Suffragan Biſhops of thoſe Metropolitans; and reſerve it as an ancient Right of each Metropolitan, with a Synod of his Provincial Biſhops, to conſecrate all the Biſhops within his Province, the Archbiſhops of *Conſtantinople* neither being conſulted, nor having [p] any hand in thoſe Ordinations. But it was otherwiſe at *Alexandria*. For the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, whilſt he was only a Metropolitan, had the Ordination of all the Biſhops of the ſix Provinces of the *Egyptian* Dioceſe, being

[o] Theod. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 5. c. 28. [p] Con. Chalced. Act. 16. in fin. Etiam nihil communicante in illorum Ordinationibus Archiepiſcopo Regiæ Conſtantinopolis,

the

the ſole and only Metropolitan in all thoſe Provinces: And having but the ſame Dioceſe when he came to be a Patriarch, he continued his ancient Cuſtom of Ordaining all the Biſhops throughout the ſix Provinces, notwithſtanding that new Metropolitans were ſet up in them. And in this the Patriarch of *Alexandria* differed from all others: For in all other Dioceſes the Metropolitans had the Right of Ordaining their Suffragan Biſhops, which here the Patriarch retained to himſelf, as an ancient Branch of his Metropolitical Power. I know indeed a very Learned [q] Perſon is of a different Opinion: He ſays, "The Biſhop of *Alexandria* was rather a loſer "by being made a Patriarch: For now according "to the Conſtitution of Church-Policy, the Ordi-"nation of Suffragan Biſhops, which before belong-"ed entirely to him, was devolved upon the ſeve-"ral Metropolitans under him. But this Aſſertion proceeds upon a Suppoſition, That Patriarchal Rights were exactly the ſame in all Places: Which from the Inſtance I have given of *Conſtantinople* appears to be otherwiſe; for the Patriarchs of *Epheſus* and *Cæſarea* had not the Ordination of their own Metropolitans, but they were all ſubject to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. And as to the Caſe of *Alexandria*, it appears from *Syneſius*, who was himſelf Metropolitan of *Ptolemais*, that the Ordination not only of the Metropolitans, but of all the Suffragan Biſhops throughout the whole Diſtrict of *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis*, belonged ſtill to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*. For in a Letter to *Theophilus*, acquainting him how He and two other Biſhops had met at *Olbiæ* to make choice of a Biſhop, and that one *Antonius* was unanimouſly choſen by the People; he adds [r],

[q] Dr. *Cave* Anc. Ch. Gov. c. 4. p. 159.

[r] Syneſ. Ep. 76. ad Theoph. ἑνὸς ἔπ δεῖ, τὸ κυριώτατον μέν τοι, τῆς ἱερᾶς σε χειρὸς.

That

That yet there was one thing wanting, which was more neceſſary than all, *viz.* His Sacred Hand to conſecrate him. Which ſhews, that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* ſtill retained his ancient Right of Conſecrating all the Biſhops of the *Egyptian* Dioceſe.

Sect. 12. *The 1ſt Privilege of Patriarchs was to Ordain all the Metropolitans of the Dioceſe, and receive his own Ordination from a Dioceſan Synod.*

In other Dioceſes the Patriarchs Power was chiefly ſeen in the Ordination or Confirmation of all the Metropolitans that were under him. This appears from the forecited Canons [*s*] of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and ſeveral of *Juſtinian*'s Novels; one of which [*t*] takes notice of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*'s Ordaining all the Metropolitans under him; and another gives the ſame Power to the Patriarch of *Juſtiniana Prima* [*u*], then newly advanced to Patriarchal Dignity by *Juſtinian*, becauſe it was the place of his Nativity. And that this was a peculiar Privilege of Patriarchs, appears farther from one of the *Arabick* Canons publiſhed by *Turrian*, under the Name of the *Nicene* Canons, which were invented after the Name of Patriarchs was well known in the Church. The 36*th* of theſe Canons ſpeaking of the Catholick of *Ethiopia* [*w*], who was no Patriarch, but ſubject to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, ſays, He ſhall not have Power to ordain Archbiſhops, as Patriarchs have; becauſe he hath not the Power or Honour of a Patriarch.

[*s*] Con. Chalc. can. 28, & Act. 16. [*t*] Juſtin. Novel. 7.

[*u*] Juſtin. Nov. 131. c. 3. Per tempus Beatiſſimum Juſtinianæ Primæ Patriæ noſtræ Archiepiſcopum habere ſemper ſub ſua Juriſdictione Epiſcopos Provinciarum Daciæ Mediterraneæ, & Daciæ Ripenſis, & Privalis (al. Triballiæ) & Dardaniæ, & Myſiæ ſuperioris, & Pannoniæ: Et ab eo hos ordinari, ipſum vero à proprio ordinari Concilio. [*w*] Con. Nicen. Arab. c. 36. Non tamen jus habeat conſtituendi Archiepiſcopos, ut habet Patriarcha; ſiquidem non habet Patriarchæ honorem & poteſtatem.

It

It was therefore the Prerogative of Patriarchs, (thoſe of *Epheſus* and *Cæſarea* only excepted) to ordain the Metropolitans under them: But they themſelves were to be ordained by a *Dioceſan* Synod, as *Juſtinian*'s forecited Novel [x] informs us. And this was called the Canonical Ordination of a Patriarch. For ſo the Council of *Conſtantinople*, in their Synodical Epiſtle to the *Weſtern* Biſhops, prove the Ordination of *Flavian* Biſhop of *Antioch* (who preſided over all the *Eaſtern* Dioceſe [y], as *Theodoret* ſays) to be Canonical, becauſe he was ordained not only by the Biſhops of the Province, but τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως, the Biſhops of the whole *Eaſtern* Dioceſe [z] Synodically met together.

Sect. 13. *A 2d Privilege was to call Dioceſan Synods, and preſide in them.*

2. The next Privilege of Patriarchs was the Power of Convening their Metropolitans and all the Provincial Biſhops to a Dioceſan Synod; which Privilege was founded upon the ſame Canons that granted Metropolitans Authority to ſummon Provincial Synods, and preſide in them. For by juſt Analogy the Patriarch was to have the ſame Power over the Metropolitans, that they had over their Provincial Biſhops. And therefore *Theodoret* [a] ſpeaking of his own Attendance at the Synods of his Patriarch at *Antioch*, ſays, he did it in Obedience to the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, which make him a Criminal that is ſummoned to a Synod, and refuſes to pay his Attendance at it.

Sect. 14. *A 3d Privilege to receive Appeals from*

3. Another Privilege of Patriarchs, was the Power of receiving Appeals from Metropolitans and Provincial Synods, and Reverſing

[x] Novel. 131. Ipſum vero (Patriarcham) à proprio ordinari Concilio. [y] Theod. H. E. lib. 5. c. 23. [z] Con. Conſtant. Ep. ad Occident. ap. Theod. H. E. lib. 5. c. 9.
[a] Theod. Ep. 81.

their

their Decrees, if they were found faulty. If any Biſhop or Clergyman have a Controverſy with the Metropolitan of his Province, let him have Recourſe to the Exarch of the Dioceſe, ſays the Council of *Chalcedon* [*b*], in one Canon: And in another [*c*], If any Man is injured by his own Biſhop, or Metropolitan, let him bring his Cauſe before the Exarch of the Dioceſe, or the Throne of *Conſtantinople*. Theſe Canons are adopted into the Civil Law, and confirmed by Imperial Edicts. For by one of *Juſtinian*'s Conſtitutions [*d*] the Patriarch is to receive Appeals from a Provincial Synod, and give a final Determination to all Cauſes that are regularly brought before him: And the regular way of proceeding is there ſpecified, which is, That no Man ſhall bring his Cauſe firſt before the Patriarch, but firſt before his own Biſhop, then before the Metropolitan, after that before a Provincial Synod, and laſt of all before the Patriarch, from whoſe Judgment there lay no Appeal. The ſame is repeated and confirmed by other Laws [*e*] of that Emperor, which need not here be recited.

Metropolitans and Provincial Synods.

Sect. 15.

A 4th Privilege to cenſure Metropolitans, and alſo their Suffragans, when Metropolitans were remiſs in cenſuring them.

4. As Patriarchs might receive Appeals from Metropolitans, ſo they had Power to enquire into their Adminiſtration, and correct and cenſure them, in caſe of Hereſy, or Miſdemeanour, or any Male-Adminiſtration, which made them liable by the Canons to Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure. *Juſtinian* made an expreſs Law to this purpoſe, [*f*] That

[*b*] Con. Chalced. can. 9. [*c*] Ibid. can. 17. [*d*] Cod. Juſt. lib. 1. Tit. 4. c. 29. [*e*] Juſt. Novel. 123. c. 22. Phot. Nomocan. Tit. 9. c. 1.

[*f*] Novel. 137. c. 5. Quoties quidam ſacerdotum accuſabuntur vel de Fide, aut turpi Vita, aut ob aliquid aliud contra ſacros Canones admiſſum; ſi quidem Epiſcopus eſt is qui accuſatus eſt, ejus

That if any Clergyman was accuſed in point of Faith, or Morals, or Tranſgreſſion of the ſacred Canons; if he was a Biſhop, he ſhould be examined before his Metropolitan; but if he was a Metropolitan, then before the Archbiſhop, that is, the Patriarch to whom he was ſubject. By vertue of this Power *Chryſoſtom* depoſed *Gerontius* [*g*] Metropolitan of *Nicomedia*: And *Atticus* decided a Controverſy between *Theodoſius* and *Agapetus* [*h*], who contended about the Throne of *Synada* the Metropolis of *Phrygia Pacatiana*: And it were eaſy to add many other Inſtances of the like Nature out of the ancient Councils, which concurred with the Patriarchs in the exerciſe of this Power.

Nor did this Power extend only over Metropolitans, but over their Suffragan Biſhops alſo. For though every Provincial Biſhop was to be tried by his own Metropolitan and a Provincial Synod; yet in caſe they were negligent and remiſs in executing the Canons againſt Delinquents, the Patriarch had Power to take the Matter into his own Cognizance, and cenſure any Biſhop within the limits of his Juriſdiction. Thus *Sozomen* [*i*] obſerves of *Chryſoſtom*, that in one Viſitation at *Epheſus* he depoſed thirteen Biſhops of *Aſia*, *Lycia* and *Phrygia* for Simony, and ſuch other corrupt Practices. This was done in a Synod of 70 Biſhops held at *Epheſus*, *An.* 401. as *Valeſius* [*k*] and *Du Pin* obſerve out of *Palladius*, who mentions the ſame thing, though he ſpeaks but of ſix Biſhops then depoſed.

---

ejus Metropolitanus examinet ea quæ dicta ſunt: Si vero Metropolitanus ſit, ejus Beatiſſimus Archiepiſcopus ſub quo degit.

[*g*] Sozom. H. E. lib 8. c. 6. [*h*] Socrat. H. E. lib. 7. c. 3.

[*i*] Sozom. H. E. lib 8. c. 6. [*k*] Valeſ. Not. in Loc. Du Pin Biblioth. Vol. 3. Vit. Chryſoſt.

Sect. 16. *A 5th Privilege. Patriarchs might make Metropolitans their Commissioners, &c.*

5. The Patriarch had Power to delegate, or send a Metropolitan into any part of his Diocese, as his Commissioner, to hear and determine Ecclesiastical Causes in his Name. At least it was so in the Diocese of *Egypt*, where *Synesius* was Bishop. For in one of his Epistles [*l*] writing to *Theophilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, he tells him what a difficult Task he had put him upon, when he sent him through an Enemy's Country, to *Hydrax* and *Palæbisca*, two Villages in the Confines of *Libya*, to determine a Dispute that was risen there about erecting of those Places into Bishops Sees: But, says he, there lies a Necessity upon me, νόμον ἡγεῖσθαι, to take every thing for a Law that is enjoined me by the Throne of *Alexandria*.

Sect. 17. *A 6th Privilege. The Patriarch to be consulted by his Metropolitans in Matters of any great Moment.*

6. And as the Metropolitans did every thing that was Canonically enjoined them by the Patriarch: So they did nothing of any great Moment without him; paying the same Deference to him, that the Canons obliged their Suffragans to pay to them. This at least was the Custom of *Egypt*, as appears from a noted Passage related in the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon* [*m*], where we find, that when Pope *Leo*'s Epistle against *Eutyches* was subscribed by all the Bishops in Council, the *Egyptian* Bishops then present refused to do it, because they had then no Patriarch, and it was not lawful for them to do it without the consent of a Patriarch, by the Rule of the Council of *Nice*, which orders all the Bishops of the *Egyptian* Diocese to follow

[*l*] Synes. Ep. 67. p. 221. [*m*] Conc. Chalced. Act. 4. p. 512, 513.

the

the Archbiſhop of *Alexandria*, and do nothing without him. This they pleaded in Council, and their Plea was accepted, and a Decree [*n*] paſſed in their favour upon it, That ſince this was the Cuſtom of the *Egyptian* Dioceſe to do nothing of this Nature without the Conſent and Authority of their Archbiſhop; they ſhould not be compelled to ſubſcribe, till a new Archbiſhop was choſen.

Sect. 18.
7. Patriarchs to communicate to the Metropolitans ſuch Imperial Laws as concerned the Church, &c.

7. It was the Patriarch's Office to publiſh both Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Laws, which concerned the Church, and to take care for the Diſperſion and Publication of them in all Churches of their Dioceſe. The Method is preſcribed by *Juſtinian* in the Epilogue to the *6th* Novel: "The Patri-"archs of every Dioceſe ſhall publiſh theſe our Laws "in their reſpective Churches, and notify them to "the Metropolitans under them. The Metropolitans "likewiſe ſhall publiſh them in their Metropolitical "Churches, and make them known to the Biſhops "under them: That ſo they may publiſh them in "their reſpective Churches, and no one be left ig-"norant in our whole Empire, of what we have en-"acted for the glory of the great God, and our Sa-"viour Jeſus Chriſt. See alſo Novel 42. directed to *Menas* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, concluding in the ſame Tenor.

Sect. 19.
The 8th Privilege. Great Criminals reſerved to the Patriarchs Abſolution.

8. *Syneſius* obſerves another Privilege in the Dioceſe of *Alexandria*, which was, That in the Exerciſe of Diſcipline upon great Criminals and Scandalous Offenders, a peculiar Deference was paid to the Patriarch, by reſerving their Abſolution to his Wiſdom and Diſcreti-

[*b*] Con. Chalc. can. 30. ex Act. 4.

on.

on. As he gives an Inſtance in one *Lamponianus* a Presbyter, whom he had Excommunicated for abuſing *Jaſon* his Fellow-Presbyter. Though, ſays he [o], "He expreſſed his Repentance with Tears, and the "People interceded for him; yet I refuſed to ab- "ſolve him, but remitted him over for that to the "ſacred See: Only aſſuming this to my ſelf, that "if the Man ſhould happen to be in manifeſt dan- "ger of Death, any Presbyter that was preſent "ſhould receive him into Communion by my Or- "der. For no Man ſhall go Excommunicate out "of the World by me. But in caſe he recovered, "he ſhould ſtill be liable to the former Penalty, "and expect the Ratification of his Pardon from "your Divine and Courteous Soul. But whether this Reſpect was paid by all Metropolitans to their Patriarch in every Dioceſe, I have not yet obſerved.

Sect. 20.
The greater Patriarchs Abſolute and Independent of one another.

9. The laſt Privilege of Patriarchs was, that they were originally all Co-ordinate and Independent of one another. I ſpeak now of them as they were at their firſt Inſtitution: For after-Ages and Councils, and Emperors, made great Alteration in this Matter. At firſt Learned Men [p] reckon there were about 13 or 14 Patriarchs in the Church, that is, one in every Capital City of each Dioceſe of the *Roman* Empire, the Patriarch of *Alexandria* over the *Egyptian* Dioceſe, The Patriarch of *Antioch* over the *Eaſtern* Dioceſe, The Patriarch of *Epheſus* over the *Aſiatick* Dioceſe, The Patriarch of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* over the *Pontick* Dioceſe; *Theſſalonica* in *Macedon* or *Illyricum Orientale*, *Sirmium* in *Illyricum Occidentale*, *Rome* in the *Roman Præfecture*, *Milan* in the *Italick*

[o] Syneſ. Ep. 67. p. 251. [p] Brerewood Patriarch. Gov. Q. 1.

Dioceſe, *Carthage* in *Africk*, *Lyons* in *France*, *Toledo* in *Spain*, and *York* in the Dioceſe of *Britain*. The greateſt part of theſe, if not all, were real Patriarchs, and independent of one another, till *Rome* by Encroachment, and *Conſtantinople* by Law got themſelves made Superior to ſome of their Neighbours, who became ſubordinate and ſubject unto them. The ancient Liberties of the *Britannick* Churches, as alſo the *African* and *Italick* Dioceſe, and their long Conteſts with *Rome*, before they could be brought to yield Obedience to her, are largely ſet forth by ſeveral of our Learned Writers [q] in particular Diſcourſes on this Subject. I only here note that the Eaſtern Patriarchs, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Epheſus*, *Cæſarea* and *Conſtantinople*, were never ſubject to *Rome*, but maintained the ancient Liberty which the Canons gave them. For though *Cæſarea* and *Epheſus* were made ſubordinate to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and any one might appeal from them to him; yet the Appeal was to be carried no farther, [r] unleſs it were to a General Council. Which ſhews the Independency of the greater Patriarchs one of another.

Sect. 21. *The Patriarch of* Conſtantinople *dignify'd with the Title of* Oecumenical, *and his Church Head of all Churches.*

The Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* had alſo the honourable Title of *Oecumenical*, or Univerſal Patriarch given him; probably in regard of the great Extent of his Juriſdiction. Thus *Juſtinian* ſtiles *Menas*, *Epiphanius*, and *Anthemius*, Archbiſhops and Oecumenical Patriarchs in ſeveral of his Reſcripts [s]; and *Leo* gives the ſame Title to *Stephen*, Archbiſhop and Univerſal Patriarch, in Ten Laws [t] one after ano-

[q] Brerewood Patr. Gov. Qu. 2 & 3. Cav. Anc. Ch. Gov. c. 5. [r] *See the Authorities cited before*, §, 14. [s] *See* Juſtin. Novel. 7. 16. 42. [t] Leo Imp. Conſtit. Novel. 2. 3, &c.

ther.

ther. So that it was no ſuch new thing as Pope *Gregory* made it, for the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* to be ſtiled Oecumenical Biſhop; for that Title was given him by Law many Years before, even from the Time of *Juſtinian*; and it is a Vulgar Error in Hiſtory to date the Original of that Title from the Time of *Gregory* I. which was in uſe at leaſt a whole Century before. But *Juſtinian* in another Reſcript goes a little farther, and [*u*] ſays expreſly, That *Conſtantinople* was the Head of all Churches. Which is as much as ever any Council allowed to *Rome*, that is, a Supremacy in its own Dioceſe, and a Precedency of Honour in regard that it was the Capital City of the Empire. Equal Privileges are granted to *Conſtantinople* upon the ſame ground, becauſe it was New *Rome*, and the Royal Seat, as the Councils of *Conſtantinople* [*w*] and *Chalcedon*, with ſome others, word it. So that they had Privileges of Honour, and Privileges of Power; the firſt of which were peculiar to thoſe two Sees; the other in a great meaſure common to them and all other Patriarchal Churches, except thoſe of *Epheſus* and *Cæſarea*, which, as I have often obſerved, were legally made ſubordinate to that of *Conſtantinople*.

Sect. 22.
Of ſubordinate Patriarchs, what Figure they made in the Church, and that they were not mere Titular Patriarchs.

Some here may be deſirous to know, what Authority thoſe Patriarchs had in the Church after their Subordination to the other. There are who tell us that they were ſunk down to the Condition of Metropolitans again by the Council of *Chalcedon*: But that is a Miſtake: For, 1ſt. they retained the Name of Exarchs of the Dioceſe ſtill, and ſo ſubſcribed themſelves in all Coun-

[*u*] Juſt. Cod. Lib. 1. Tit. 3. c. 24. Conſtantinopolitana Eccleſia omnium aliarum eſt Caput. [*w*] Con. Conſt. Can. 3. Con. Chalced. Can. 28. Con. Trull. Can. 36. Juſtin. Novel. 131. c. 2.

cils. As in the *6th* General Council, *Theodore* ſubſcribes himſelf Metropolitan of *Epheſus*, and Exarch of the *Aſiatick* Dioceſe [x]; and *Philalethes*, Metropolitan of *Cæſarea*, and Exarch of the *Pontick* Dioceſe. 2dly, They always ſat and voted in General Councils, next immediately after the five great Patriarchs, *Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jeruſalem*, who by the Canons [y] had Precedence of all the reſt. Next to theſe, before all the Metropolitans, the Biſhops of *Epheſus* and *Cæſarea* took place, as may be ſeen in the Subſcriptions of the 4th and 6th General [z] Councils. 3dly, They had Power to receive Appeals from Metropolitans, which is evident from the ſame Canons of *Chalcedon*, which give [a] the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* Power to take Appeals from them. So that they were not mere Titular Patriarchs, as ſome in After-Ages, but had the Power as well as the Name; the Right of Ordaining Metropolitans, and receiving ultimate Appeals only excepted. But how long they or any others retained their Power, is not my Buſineſs here any farther to enquire.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Αὐτοκέφαλοι.

Sect. 1. *All Metropolitans anciently ſtiled* Αὐτοκέφαλοι.

AMong other Titles which were anciently given to ſome certain Biſhops, we frequently meet with the Name Αὐτοκέφαλοι, abſolute and independent Biſhops: which was not the Name of any one ſort of Biſhops, but given to ſeveral upon different Reaſons. For

[x] Con. 6. Gen. Act. 18. [y] *See* Conc. Trull. Can. 36. & Juſtin. Novel. 131. c. 2. [z] Con. Chalced. Act. 1, & 3. Con. 6. Gen. Act. 18. [a] Con. Chalc. Can. 9, & 17.

firſt,

firſt, before the ſetting up of Patriarchs, all Metropolitans were Αὐτοκέφαλοι, ordering the Affairs of their own Province with their Provincial Biſhops, and being accountable to no Superior but a Synod, and that in caſe of Hereſie, or ſome great Crime committed againſt Religion and the Rules of the Church.

Sect. 2. *Some Metropolitans Independent after the ſetting up of Patriarchal Power, as thoſe of* Cyprus, Iberia, Armenia, *and the Church of* Britain.

And even after the Advancement of Patriarchs, ſeveral Metropolitans continued thus Independent; receiving their Ordination from their own Provincial Synod, and not from any Patriarch; terminating all Controverſies in their own Synods, from which there was no Appeal to any Superior, except a General Council. *Balſamon* reckons among this ſort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι the Metropolitans of *Bulgaria*, [b] *Cyprus* and *Iberia*. And his Obſervation is certainly true of the two laſt, who were only Metropolitans, yet Independent of any Patriarchal or Superior Power. For though the Biſhop of *Antioch* laid claim to the Ordination of the *Cyprian* Biſhops in the Council of *Epheſus*, yet the Council upon hearing the Caſe, determined againſt him, making a Decree, [c] That whereas it never had been the Cuſtom for the Biſhop of *Antioch* to ordain Biſhops in *Cyprus*, the *Cyprian* Biſhops ſhould retain their Rights inviolable, and according to Canon and ancient Cuſtom ordain Biſhops among themſelves. And this was again repeated and confirmed by the Council of *Trullo*, [d] even after the *Cypriots* were driven into another Country by the Incurſions of the *Barbarians*.

[b] Balſam. in Con. Conſtan. 1. Can. 2.
[c] Con. Epheſ. Act. 7. Decret. de Cypr. Epiſ.
[d] Con. Trull. Can. 39.

Others [e] obſerve the ſame Privilege in the *Iberian* Churches, now commonly called *Georgians*; that they never were ſubject either to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, or any other; but all their Biſhops, being Eighteen in Number, profeſs abſolute Obedience to their own Metropolitan, without any other higher Dependance or Relation.

And this was the Caſe of the *Armenian* Churches in the time of *Photius*, as appears from an ancient *Greek Notitia Epiſcopatuum*, cited by *Peter de Marca*, [f] which ſays it was an Αὐτοκέφαλος, and not ſubject to the Throne of *Conſtantinople*, but honoured with Independency in reſpect to St. *Gregory* of *Armenia* their firſt Apoſtle.

And this was alſo the ancient Liberty of the *Britannick* Church, before the coming of *Auſtin* the Monk, when the Seven *Britiſh* Biſhops, which were all that were then remaining, paid Obedience to the Archbiſhop of *Caer-Leon*, and acknowledged no Superior in Spirituals above him. As *Dinothus* the Learned Abbot of *Bangor* told *Auſtin* [g] in the Name of all the *Britannick* Churches, That they owed no other Obedience to the Pope of *Rome*, than they did to every Godly Chriſtian, to love every one in his Degree in perfect Charity: Other Obedience than this, they knew none due to him whom he named Pope, *&c.* But they were under the Government of the Biſhop of *Caer-Leon* upon *Uske*, who was their Overſeer under God.

Sect. 3. *A 3d ſort of* Αὐτοκέφαλοι, *ſuch Biſhops as were ſubject to no Metropolitan but*

Beſides all theſe there was yet a Third ſort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι, which were ſuch Biſhops as were ſubject to no Metropolitan, but immediately under the Patriarch of the

[e] Brerewood Enquir. c. 17. Chytræus de Statu Eccleſ. &c.
[f] Marca de Primat. n. 27. p. 122.
[g] Spelman. Con. Brit. an. 601. T. 1. p. 108.

Dioceſe,

Dioceſe, who was to them inſtead of a Metropolitan. Thus for Inſtance in the Patriarchate or large Dioceſe of *Conſtantinople*, the ancient *Notitia*, publiſhed by *Leunclavius* [*h*], reckons 39 ſuch Biſhops throughout the ſeveral Provinces: That publiſhed by Dr. *Beverege* [*i*] counts them Forty one, and the *Notitia* in *Carolus à Sancto Paulo* [*k*] augments the Number to Forty ſix. The Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* is ſaid [*l*] to have had Twenty five ſuch Biſhopricks in his Patriarchate, and the Biſhop of *Antioch* Sixteen, as *Nilus Doxopatrius*, a Writer of the Eleventh Century, in his Book of the Patriarchal Sees informs us. But what time this ſort of Independent Biſhopricks were firſt ſet up in the Church, is not certain: For the earlieſt Account we have of them, is in the *Notitia* of the Emperor *Leo Sapiens*, written in the 9th Century, where they are called Archbiſhopricks, as in ſome other *Notitia's* they are called Metropolitical Sees; though both theſe Names were but Titular, for they had no Suffragan Biſhops under them.

only to the Patriarch of the Dioceſe.

Sect. 4

A Fourth ſort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι.

Valeſius mentions another ſort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι, which were ſuch Biſhops as were wholly Independent of all others. As they had no Suffragans under them, ſo neither did they acknowledge any Superior above them, whether Metropolitan or Patriarch, or any other whatſoever. Of this ſort he reckons the Biſhops [*m*] of *Jeruſalem*, before they were advanced to Patriarchal Dignity: But in this Inſtance he plainly miſtakes, and contradicts St. *Jerom*, who ſays expreſly, that the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* was ſub-

[*h*] Leunclav. Jus Gr. Rom. T. 1. Lib. 2. p. 88.
[*i*] Bevereg. Pandect. T. 2. Not. in Can. 26. Concil. Trull.
[*k*] Car. à S. Paulo Append. ad Geogr Sacr. p. 10.
[*l*] Nilus Doxopatr. ap. le Moyne Varia Sacra. T. 1.
[*m*] Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. Lib. 5. c. 23. *See* Chap. 17. §. 7.

ject to the Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, as the Metropolitan of all *Paleſtine*, and to the Biſhop of *Antioch* as Metropolitan of the whole Eaſt, as has been noted in the laſt Chapter. If there were any ſuch Biſhops as he ſpeaks of, they muſt be ſuch as the Biſhop of *Tomis* in *Scythia*, who, as *Sozomen* [*n*] notes, was the only Biſhop of all the Cities of that Province: So that he could neither have any Suffragans under him, nor Metropolitan above him. But ſuch Inſtances are very rare, and we ſcarce meet with ſuch another Example in all the Hiſtory of the Church. I have now compleated the Account of Primitive Biſhops, and ſhewed the Diſtinctions which were among them in the external Polity of the Church; I proceed in the next place therefore to conſider the ſecond Order of the Clergy, which is that of Preſbyters.

CHAP. XIX.

Of Presbyters.

Sect. 1. *The meaning of the Name Presbyter.*

THE Name, πρεσβύτεροι, Preſbyters, or Elders, is a Word borrowed from the *Greek* Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, where it commonly ſignifies Rulers and Governors, being (as St. *Jerom* [*a*] notes) a Name of Office and Dignity, and not a mere Indication of Mens Age: For Elders were choſen, not by their Age, but by their Merits and Wiſdom. So that as a Senator among the *Romans*, and an Alderman in our own Language, ſignifies a Perſon of ſuch an Order and Station, without any regard to his Age, in like manner a

[*n*] Sozom. Lib. 6. c. 21. Lib. 7. c. 19. [*a*] Hieron. in Eſai. 3. T. 5. p. 16. in Scripturis Sanctis Presbyteros Merito & Sapientia eligi, non ætate.

Presbyter

Presbyter or Elder in the Christian Church is one who is ordained to a certain Office, and authorized by his Quality, not by his Age, to discharge the several Duties of that Office and Station, wherein he is placed.

Sect. 2. *Apostles and Bishops sometimes called Presbyters.*

And in this large extensive Sense, 'tis readily granted by all, that Bishops are sometimes called Presbyters in the New Testament: For the Apostles themselves do not refuse the Title. On the other hand, 'tis the Opinion of many Learned Men, both [*b*] Ancient and [*c*] Modern, that Presbyters were sometimes called Bishops, whilst the Bishops that were properly such, were distinguished by other Titles, as that of Chief Priests and Apostles, *&c.* of which I have given a particular Account in one of the preceding Chapters, and there evinced that they who maintained this Identity of Names, did not thence infer an Identity of Offices, but always esteemed Bishops and Presbyters to be distinct Orders.

Sect. 3. *The Osiginal of Presbyters properly so called.*

Here then, taking Presbyters in the strictest Sense, for those only of the 2*d.* Order, we must first enquire into their Original. The Learned Dr. *Hammond* [*d*] advances an Opinion about this Matter, which is something Singular. He asserts, that in Scripture-times the Name of Presbyters belonged principally, if not alone, to Bishops; and that there is no Evidence, that any of this 2*d.* Order were then instituted, tho' soon after, he thinks, before the writing of *Ignatius*'s

[*b*] Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Phil. 1 It. Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. 3. Theodoret. Com. in Phil. 1. 1. It. in Phil. 2 25. & in 1 Tim. 3. 1. Ambrosiaster in Eph. 4. 11. Hieron. Com. in Tit. 2. Ep. 83. ad Ocean. & 85. ad Evagr. [*c*] Usser. Dissert. in Ignat. c. 18. p. 232. It. Orig. *of* Bish. & Metrop. p. 55. Coteler. Not. in Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 1. [*d*] Ham. Annot. *on* Act. 11. 30.

Epistles,

Epiſtles, there were ſuch inſtituted in all Churches. The Authorities he builds upon are *Clemens Romanus*, and *Epiphanius*, who ſay, that in ſome Churches at firſt there were Biſhops and Deacons, without any Presbyters. But I conceive it will not hence follow, that it was ſo in all Churches: Nor does *Epiphanius* maintain that, but the contrary, That as in ſome Churches [*e*] there were only Biſhops and Deacons, ſo in others there were only Presbyters and Deacons; and that in large and populous Churches the Apoſtles ſettled both Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons; as at *Epheſus*, where *Timothy* was Biſhop, and had Presbyters ſubject to him; which *Epiphanius* proves from Scripture: That a Biſhop and Presbyter, ſays he, are not the ſame, the Apoſtle informs us, when writing to *Timothy*, who was a Biſhop, he bids him not rebuke an Elder, but intreat him as a Father. How comes the Biſhop to be concerned not to rebuke an Elder, if he had no Power over an Elder? In like manner the Apoſtle ſays, Againſt an Elder receive not an Accuſation, but before two or three Witneſſes: But he never ſaid to any Presbyter, Receive not an Accuſation againſt a Biſhop; nor did he ever write to any Presbyter, not to rebuke a Biſhop. This plainly implies, that in all ſuch large and populous Churches as that of *Epheſus*, according to *Epiphanius*, all the three Orders of Biſhops, Preſbyters and Deacons, were ſettled by the Apoſtles; though the ſmaller Churches were differently ſupplied at firſt, ſome only with Presbyters and Deacons, before Biſhops were conſtituted in them, and others only with Biſhops and Deacons, without any Presbyters. For all Churches had not immediately all the ſame Church-Officers upon their firſt Foundation, but Time was required to compleat their

[*e*] Epiph. Hær. 75. Aerian. n. 5.

Conſti-

Conſtitution, as Biſhop *Pearſon* [*f*] has obſerved on this very Paſſage of *Epiphanius*.

Sect. 4. *The Powers and Privileges of Presbyters.*

Admitting then that Presbyters, as well as Biſhops, were originally ſettled in the Church by the Apoſtles, we are next to enquire into the Power and Privileges that were proper to their Order. And here I ſhall have occaſion to ſay the leſs, having already ſhewed * what Offices they might perform by vertue of their ordinary Power, only acting in Dependance on, and Subordination to their Biſhop, as the Supreme Miniſter of the Church: They might Baptize, Preach, Conſecrate and Adminiſter the *Euchariſt*, &c. in the Biſhop's Abſence, or in his Preſencc, if he authorized and deputed them, as has been noted before: They might alſo reconcile Penitents, and grant them Abſolution in the Biſhop's Abſence: And ſome think they had Power likewiſe to Confirm in Caſes of Neceſſity, by ſpecial Licenſe and Delegation. But theſe two things will be conſidered and diſcuſſed more particularly hereafter, when we come to treat of Diſcipline and Confirmation. What is farther to be noted in this Place, is the Honour and Reſpect that was paid to them, acting in Conjunction with their Biſhop, who ſcarce did any thing in the Adminiſtration and Government of the Church, without the Advice, Conſent, and amicable Concurrence of his Presbyters.

Sect. 5. *Presbyters allowed to ſit with the Biſhop on Thrones in the Church.*

Hence it was that Presbyters were allowed to ſit together with the Biſhop in the Church (which Privilege was never allowed to Deacons): And their Seats were

[*f*] Pearſon. Vind. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 13. p. 412. In aliquibus Eccleſiis ab origine fuiſſe Presbyteros, nondum conſtitutis Epiſcopis; in aliquibus Epiſcopos, nondum conſtitutis Presbyteris.

* *See before* Chap. 3.

dig-

dignified with the Name of Thrones as the Biſhop's was, only with this difference, that his was the High Throne, and theirs the Second Thrones. In Alluſion to this, *Gregory Nazianzen* [*g*] ſpeaking of his own Ordination to the Degree of Presbyter, ſays, His Father who ordained him, brought him by Violence to the Second Thrones. And in his Viſion concerning the Church of *Anaſtaſia* [*h*], he thus repreſents the ſeveral Orders of the Church: Methought I ſaw my ſelf (the Biſhop) ſitting on the High Throne, and the Presbyters, that is, the Guides of the Chriſtian Flock, ſitting on both ſides by me on lower Thrones, and the Deacons ſtanding by them. By this we may underſtand what *Conſtantine* meant in his Letter [*i*] to *Chreſtus* Biſhop of *Syracuſe*, when giving him a Summons to the Council of *Arles*, he bids him alſo bring with him two of the Second Throne, that is, two Presbyters: And what *Euſebius* means by thoſe Words in his Panegyrick [*k*] upon the Temple of *Paulinus*, where he ſays, he Beautified and Adorned the Structure with Thrones ſet up on high, for the Honour of the Preſidents or Rulers. By which it is plain he means the Thrones of the Preſbyters, as well as the Biſhop: For they were both exalted above the Seats of the Common People. Nay, both the Name and Thing was then ſo uſual, that *Aerius* drew it into an Argument [*l*], to prove the Identity and Parity of Biſhops and Presbyters: A Biſhop ſits upon a Throne, and ſo does a Presbyter likewiſe. Which though it be but a very lame and fooliſh Argument to prove what he intended, yet it is a plain Intimation of what has here been

[*g*] Naz. Carm. de Vita, κάμπτῃς ἑαίως εἰς δεύτερους θρόνους.

[*h*] Id. Somn. de Eccleſia Anaſtaſiæ. Orat. 20. de Laud. Baſil. p. 310. δεύτερα τ καθέδρας. δύο γέρανας τὴν ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ θρόνῳ.

[*i*] Ap. Euſeb. lib. 10. c. 5.

[*k*] Euſeb. lib. 10. c. 4.

[*l*] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Aerian.

noted,

noted, to have been the then known Cuſtom and Practice of the Church: And little regard is to be had to thoſe Modern Authors, who pretend to ſay, that Presbyters had not Power to ſit in the Preſence of their Biſhops; which is confuted by the Acts and Canons [*m*] almoſt of every Council, and the Writings of every ancient Author, in which nothing more commonly occurs than the Phraſes, *Conſeſſus Presbyterorum*, and *ſedere in Presbyteri*, importing the Cuſtom and Privilege whereof we are now ſpeaking.

Sect. 6. *The form of their ſitting in a Semicircle: Whence they were called* Corona Preſbyterii.

There is one thing farther to be noted concerning the manner of their Sitting, which was on each hand of the Biſhop, in the form or figure of a Semicircle; which is deſcribed by the Author [*n*] of the Conſtitutions under the Name of *Clemens Romanus*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*, and others. Whence as the Biſhop's Throne is called the Middle Throne, or the Middle Seat by *Theodoret* [*o*] and the Conſtitutions: So for the ſame Reaſon *Ignatius* [*p*] and the Conſtitutions [*q*] term the Presbyters the Spiritual Crown or Circle of the Presbytery, and the Crown of the Church: Unleſs we will take this for a Metaphorical Expreſſion, to denote only that Presbyters united with their Biſhop, were the Glory of the Church.

Sect. 7. *Presbyters the Eccleſiaſtical Senate, or Council of the Church,*

This Honour was done them in regard to their Authority in the Church, wherein they were con-

[*m*] Con. Carthag. 4. c. 35, 36. Euſeb. lib. 6. c. 20. Origen. Hom. 2. in Cantic. Con. Laodic. c. 55. Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 2. c. 57. Con. Ancyr. c. 18. [*n*] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 2. c. 57. Κείσθω ὁ μέσος ὁ τοῦ ὁπισχόπου Θρόνος, &c. [*o*] Theod. Hiſt. lib. 5. c. 3. Ὁ μέσος Θῶκος. [*p*] Ignat. Ep. ad Magneſ. n. 13. στεφανον πνευματικον τὸ πρεσβυτερίου.

[*q*] Conſtitut. lib. 2. c. 28. στεφανὸν ἐκκλησίας. ſidered

whom the Biſhop conſulted and adviſed with upon all Occaſions.

ſidered as a ſort of Eccleſiaſtical Senate, or Council to the Biſhop, who ſcarce did any thing of great Weight and Moment without asking their Advice, and taking their Conſent, to give the greater Force and Authority to all publick Acts done in the Name of the Church. Upon which Account, St. *Chryſoſtom* [r] and *Syneſius* [s] ſtile them the Court or Sanhedrim of the Presbyters; and *Cyprian* [t] the Sacred and Venerable Bench of the Clergy; St. *Jerom* [u] and others [w], the Churches Senate, and the Senate of Chriſt; *Origen* [x] and the Author of the [y] Conſtitutions, The Biſhop's Counſellors, and the Council of the Church: Becauſe though the Biſhop was Prince and Head of this Eccleſiaſtical Senate, and nothing could regularly be done without him; yet neither did he ordinarily do any publick Act, relating to the Government or Diſcipline of the Church without their Advice and Aſſiſtance.

Sect. 8.

Some Evidences out of Ignatius *and* Cyprian, *of the Power and Prerogatives of Presbyters in Conjunction with the Biſhop.*

The firſt Ages afford the moſt pregnant Proofs of this Divine Harmony between the Biſhop and his Presbyters. For any one that ever looked into the Writings of *Cyprian*, muſt acknowledge, that at *Rome* and *Carthage*, the two great Churches of the *Weſt*, all things were thus tranſact-

[r] Chryſ. de Sacerdot. lib. 3. c. 15. τὸ τῆς πρεσβυτέρων συνέδριον. [s] Syneſ. Ep. 67. ad Theoph. [t] Cypr. Ep. 55. al. 59. ad Cornel. Cleri Sacrum venerandumq; Conſeſſum. Concil. Carth. 4. c. 35. Epiſcopus in Conſeſſu Presbyterorum ſublimior ſedeat, &c. [u] Hieron. in Eſai. 3. Tom. 5. p. 17. Et nos habemus in Eccleſia ſenatum noſtrum, Cœtum Presbyterorum. [w] Pius Ep. 2. ad Juſt. Vien. Salutat te ſenatus pauper Chriſti apud Romam conſtitutus. [x] Orig. Com. in Mat. βουλὴ ἐκκλησίας. Pearſon. Vind. Ignat. par. 1. c. 11. p. 321. Hi autem βουλευταὶ Chriſtiani ſane fuerunt Presbyteri.

[y] Conſt. Apoſt. lib. 2. c. 28. σύμβουλοι τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, συνέδριον καὶ βουλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

ed

ed by joint Conſent: The Biſhop with his Clergy did *communi Conſilio* [z] *ponderare*, weigh things by common Advice and Deliberation; whether it was in the Ordinations of the Clergy; (for *Cyprian* would not ſo much as ordain a Subdeacon or a Reader without their Conſent;) Or whether it was in the Exerciſe of Diſcipline and Reconciliation of Penitents, *Cyprian* declares [a] his Reſolution to do all by common Conſent. And ſo *Cornelius* at the ſame time acted at *Rome*: For when *Maximus* and the reſt of the Confeſſors, who had ſided with *Novatian*, came afterward and made Confeſſion of their Error, and deſired to be admitted again into the Communion of the Church, *Cornelius* would do nothing in it, till he had firſt called a Presbytery, and taken both their Advice and Conſent [b] in the Affair, that he might proceed according to their unanimous Reſolution. *Cyprian* in ſeveral other of his Epiſtles [c], ſpeaks of the ſame Deference paid to his Presbytery, and in one Place he more particularly tells them, that it was a Law and a Rule [d] that he had laid down to himſelf, from the firſt entrance on his Biſhoprick, that he would do nothing without their Advice, and the Conſent of the People. *Epiphanius* obſerves the ſame Practice at *Epheſus* in the Condemnation of *Noëtus*: For firſt, he ſays, he was convened

[z] Cypr. Ep. 33. al. 38. ad. Cler. In Ordinationibus clericis ſolemus vos ante conſulere, & mores ac merita ſingulorum communi Conſilio ponderare. [a] Id. Ep. 6. al. 14. ad Cler. Ut ea quæ circa Eccleſiæ Gubernaculum utilitas communis expoſcit, tractare ſimul, & plurimorum Conſilio examinata limare poſſemus. [b] Cornel. Ep. 46. al. 49. ad Cypr. p. 92. Omni actu ad me perlato, placuit contrahi Presbyterium - - - - ut firmato conſilio, quid circa Perſonam eorum obſervari deberet, Conſenſu omnium ſtatueretur. [c] Cypr. Ep. 24. al. 29. ad Cler. Ep. 32. ad Cler. [d] Cypr. Ep. 6. al. 14. Quando à Primordio Epiſcopatus mei ſtatuerim, nihil ſine Conſilio veſtro, & ſine Conſenſu Plebis, mea privata Sententia gerere: Sed cum ad vos per Dei gratiam venero - - - in commune tractabimus.

before

before the Presbytery [e], and then again upon a Relapse by them expelled the Church. Which at least must mean, that the Bishop and his Presbyters joined together in this Ecclesiastical Censure. In like manner speaking of the first Condemnation of *Arius*, he says, *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria* [f] called a Presbytery against him, before whom, and some Bishops then present, he examined him, and expelled him. *Cotelerius* in his Notes upon the Constitutions, has published, from an ancient Manuscript, one of the Forms of *Arius*'s Deposition [g], which may give some light to this Matter. For thereby it appears, that when *Alexander* sent forth his Circular Letters to all other Bishops against *Arius*, he first summoned all the Presbyters and Deacons of *Alexandria*, and Region of *Mareotes*, not only to hear what he had written, but also to testify their Consent to it, and declare that they agreed with him in the Condemnation of *Arius*. From whence we learn, that though the Deposition was properly the Bishops Act, yet to have it done with the greater Solemnity, the Consent both of the Presbyters and Deacons was required to it. And thus it was also in the Condemnation of *Origen*: The Council of *Alexandria*, which expelled him the City, was composed both of Bishops and Presbyters, who decreed that he should remove from *Alexandria*, and neither teach nor inhabit there, as *Pamphilus* [h] relates in the second Book

[e] Epiph. Hær. 57. n. 1. ὅτι πρεσβυτείᾳ ἀχρώμενος. Ibid. οἱ αὐτοὶ πρεσβύτεροι ἐξέωσε αὐτὸν ἐκ ἐκκλησίας.

[f] Epiph. Hær. 69. Arian. n. 3. συγκαλεῖ τὸ πρεσβυτέριον, καὶ ἄλλους πινὰς ἐπισκόπους παρόντας, &c. [g] Depositio Arii ap Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. 8. c. 28. Ἵνα καὶ τὰ νῦν γραφόμενα γνῶτε, ἅ τε ἐν τούτοις συμφωνίαν ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδείξησθε, καὶ τῇ καθαιρέσει τοῦ ὁσίου Ἀρείου σύμψηφοι γένησθε.

[h] Pamphil. Apol. ap. Phot. Cod. 118. p. 298. Σαφῶς ἀθροίζει ἐπισκόπων καὶ πινῶν Πρεσβυτέρων κατ' Ὠριγένους.

of

of his Apology for *Origen*, ſome Fragments of which are preſerved in *Photius*. The Council of *Rome*, that was gathered againſt *Novatian*, conſiſted of ſixty Biſhops, and many more [*i*] Presbyters and Deacons. The firſt Council of *Antioch*, that was held againſt *Paulus Samoſatenſis*, had alſo [*k*] Presbyters and Deacons in it; The Name of one of them, *Malchion* a Presbyter of *Antioch*, is ſtill remaining in the Synodical Epiſtle among the Biſhops in the Inſcription.

From all which it appears, that this was an ancient Privilege of Presbyters to ſit and deliberate with Biſhops, both in their Conſiſtorial and Provincial Councils. And if we aſcend yet higher, we ſhall find Matters always thus tranſacted in the Church *ab Origine*; as appears from *Ignatius*, whoſe Writings (as a Learned Man obſerves [*l*], ſpeak as much for the Honour of the Presbytery, as they do for the Superiority of Epiſcopacy: No ancient Author having given ſo many great and noble Characters of the Presbytery, as he does. For which reaſon it concerns thoſe, who are moſt zealous for the Honour and Authority of Presbyters, to look upon *Ignatius* as one of the beſt Aſſerters and Defenders of their Power and Reputation. For he always joins the Biſhops and Presbyters together, as preſiding over the Church, the one in the Place of God and Jeſus Chriſt, and the other as the great Council of God in the room of the Apoſtles. Thus in his Epiſtle [*m*]

[*i*] Euſeb. lib. 6 c. 43. [*k*] Euſeb. lib. 7. c. 28.

[*l*] Pearſon. Vind. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 16. p. 428. Si quid ego in hac re intelligo, quicunq; Presbyterali Dignitati Auctoritatique maxime ſtudent, non habent ſuæ Exiſtimationis firmius aut ſolidius Fundamentum, quàm Epiſtolas Sancti Ignatii noſtri: Neq; enim in ullo vere antiquo Scriptore extra has Epiſtolas tot ac tanta Presbyteratus Præconia invenient, neq; illius Ordinis honorem ſine Epiſcopatus Prærogativa ullibi conſtitutum reperient.

[*m*] Ignat. Ep. ad Epheſ. n. 2. ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ πρεσβυτερίῳ.

to the *Epheſians*, he bids them be ſubject to the Biſhop and the Presbytery: And in his Epiſtle to the *Magneſians* [n], he commends *Sotion* the Deacon, becauſe he was ſubject to the Biſhop as the Gift of God, and to the Presbytery, as the Law of Chriſt. And a little after in the ſame Epiſtle, he ſpeaks of the Biſhop as preſiding [o] in the place of God, and the Presbyters in the place of the Council of Apoſtles. So in his Epiſtle to the *Trallians* [p], he bids them be ſubject to the Presbytery, as to the Apoſtles of *Jeſus Chriſt*. And again, Reverence the [q] Preſbyters, as the Council of God, and the united Company of Apoſtles: Without which no Church is called a Church. Several other Paſſages of the ſame Importance may be ſeen in his Epiſtles to *Polycarp* and the Church of [r] *Smyrna*.

Sect. 9
The Power of Preſbyters thought by ſome to be a little diminiſhed in the 4th *Century.*

And indeed all his Epiſtles are ſo full of great Elogium's of the Preſbytery, as acting in the Nature of an Eccleſiaſtical Senate together with the Biſhop, that our late Learned Defender of thoſe Epiſtles thence concludes, That the Power and Privileges of Presbyteries was greater in the 2*d*. Century, when *Ignatius* lived, than in the 4*th* Age of the Church, when he thinks the Power and Authority of Presbyteries was a little ſunk and diminiſhed over all the World, and even at *Alexandria* it ſelf, where it had moſt of all flouriſhed. And this he makes an Argument of the Antiquity of thoſe Epiſtles, that they were the Genuine Product of *Ignatius*, becauſe no one of the 4*th* Age would have gi-

[n] Ep. ad Magneſ. n. 2. [o] Ep. ad Magneſ. n. 6. Περιχαρῶς ἐπισκόπῳ εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων. [p] Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. Ὑποτάσσεσθε τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις. [q] Ibid. n. 3. Ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς σωδεσμὸν Ἀποστόλων. Χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται. [r] Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 7. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8.

ven

ven ſuch Encomiums of the Presbytery, or armed [s] them with ſo great Authority and Power. I ſhall not diſpute this Matter, nor enter upon any nice Compariſon of the different Powers of Presbyters in theſe two Ages, but only repreſent to the Reader what Privileges ſtill remained to them in the 4*th* Century.

Sect. 10. *Yet ſtill they were admitted to join with the Biſhop in the Impoſition of Hands in the Ordination of Presbyters.*

And here it cannot be denied, but that in this Age, in the Ordination of a Presbyter, all the Preſbyters that were preſent were allowed, nay even required to join with the Biſhop in Impoſition of Hands upon the Party to be ordained. That it was ſo in the *African* Churches is beyond all Diſpute: For in the 4*th* Council of *Carthage* [t], there is a Canon expreſly enjoining it: When a Presbyter is ordained, while the Biſhop pronounces the Benediction, and lays his Hand upon his Head, all the Presbyters that are preſent ſhall lay their Hands by the Biſhop's Hand upon his Head alſo. And this in all likelihood was the Univerſal Practice of the Church. For in the Conſtitutions of the Church of *Alexandria* [u], there is a Rule to the ſame purpoſe. In the *Latin* Church the Decree of the Council of *Carthage* ſeems alſo to have prevailed, becauſe it is inſerted into their Canon Law by *Gratian* [w]

[s] Pearſon. Vindic Ignat. Par. 2. c. 16. p. 428. Nemo tam ſeris Eccleſiæ temporibus---Presbyterium tot laudibus cumulaſſet, tanta auctoritate armaſſet, cujus poteſtas ea Tempeſtate, etiam Alexandriæ, ubi maxime floruerat, tantopere imminuta eſt.

[t] Con. Carth. 4. c. 3. Presbyter cum ordinatur, Epiſcopo eum benedicente, & manum ſuper caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui præſentes ſunt, manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput illius teneant. [u] Eccl Alex. Conſtit. c. 6. ap. Bevereg. Not. in Canon Apoſt. c. 2. Cum vult Epiſcopus ordinare Presbyterum, manum ſuam capiti ejus imponat, ſimulq; omnes Presbyteri iſtud tangant. [w] Grat. Diſt. 23. c. 8. Ivo Part. 6. c. 12.

and other Collectors, from whence it became the common Practice of our own Church, which is continued to this Day. Some ancient Canons [*x*] indeed ſay, That one Biſhop alone ſhall ordain a Presbyter: But that is not ſaid to exclude Presbyters from aſſiſting, but only to put a difference between the Ordination of a Biſhop and a Presbyter: For the Ordination of a Biſhop could not regularly be performed without the concurrence of three Biſhops with the Metropolitan; but a Presbyter might be ordained by a ſingle Biſhop, without any other Aſſiſtance, ſave that of his Presbyters joining with him. And this plainly appears to have been the Practice of the *4th* Century.

Sect. 11. *And allowed to ſit in Conſiſtory with their Biſhops.*

It is farther evident from the Records of the ſame Age, that Presbyters had ſtill the Privilege of ſitting in Conſiſtory with their Biſhops. For Pope *Siricius* in the latter end of this Century acted as *Cornelius* had done before him. When he went about to condemn the Errors of *Jovinian*, he firſt called [*y*] a Presbytery, and with their Advice, cenſured his Doctrines, and then with the Conſent of the Deacons alſo, and the reſt of the Clergy, expelled him the Church. And ſo likewiſe *Syneſius* Biſhop of *Ptolemais* proceeded againſt *Andronicus* the Impious and Blaſpheming Prefect of *Pentapolis*: He firſt laid open his horrible Crimes before the Conſiſtory of his Church, and then with their Conſent pronounced the Sentence of Excommunication againſt him; which he therefore calls

[*x*] Can. Apoſt. c. 2. Con. Carthag. 3. c. 45. [*y*] Siric. Ep. 2. ad Eccleſ. Mediolan. Facto Presbyterio, conſtitit Doctrinæ noſtræ, id eſt, Chriſtianæ Legi eſſe contraria——Unde omnium noſtrorum tam Presbyterorum & Diaconorum, quam totius Cleri unam ſcitote fuiſſe ſententiam, ut Jovinianus, Auxentius, *&c.* in perpetuum damnati, extra Eccleſiam remanerent.

the

the Act of the Conſiſtory [z] or *Sanhedrim* of *Ptolemais*, in the Circular Letters which he wrote to give notice of his Excommunication to other Churches. *Baronius* indeed, and the common Editors of the Councils reckon this by miſtake among the Provincial Synods: But it appears evidently from *Syneſius*, that it was only the private Conſiſtory of the Church of *Ptolemais*: For he ſays expreſly [a], the Church of *Ptolemais* gave notice of this Excommunication to all her Siſter-Churches throughout the World, requiring them to hold *Andronicus* Excommunicated, and not to deſpiſe her Act, as being only a poor Church in a ſmall City. Which agrees very well with the State of a private Conſiſtory, but is not ſpoken in the Stile of a Provincial Council.

Sect. 12. *As alſo in Provincial Councils.*

Yet this is not ſaid with any deſign to deny that Presbyters were allowed to ſit in Provincial Synods: For there are undeniable Evidences of their enjoying this Privilege within the compaſs of the fourth Century, and After-Ages alſo. In the Council of *Eliberis*, which was held in the beginning of the *4th* Age, there were no leſs than 36 Presbyters [b] ſitting together with the Biſhops, as is expreſly ſaid in the Acts of the Council. The firſt Council of *Arles*, called by *Conſtantine*, had alſo ſeveral Presbyters in it, the Names of many of which are loſt, as are alſo the Names of moſt of the Biſhops, who were Two Hundred, yet the Names of Fifteen Presbyters [c] are ſtill remaining. And it is obſervable, that in *Conſtantine's Tractoriæ*, or Letters of Summons, the Presbyters as

[z] Syneſ. Ep. 57. p. 190. Νυνὶ δὲ δὶς τὸ συνέδριον μετῆλθε τὴν Ἀνδρονίκου μανίαν, ἀκόσατε. [a] Id. Ep. 58. p. 199.

[b] Con. Eliber. Proœm. Reſidentibus etiam 36 al. 26. Presbyteris, adſtantibus Diaconibus & omni Plebe. [c] Con. Arelat. 1. in Catalogo eorum qui Concilio interfuerunt. In Edit. Crab. male vocat. Secundum.

well as Biſhops were called by Imperial Edict to attend at that Council; if we may judge of all the reſt by that one Example which remains upon Record in *Euſebius*: For there in the Letter ſent to ſummon *Chreſtus* Biſhop of *Syracuſe*, Orders are given him [*d*] to bring along with him two of the ſecond Throne; which Phraſe, as has been obſerved before, denotes two Presbyters. So that from hence it is clear, that Presbyters were then privileged to ſit in Council with their Biſhops, and that by Imperial Edict. In *Juſtellus*'s *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, there are three or four *Roman* Councils, where the Presbyters are particularly mentioned as Sitting, and ſometimes Voting with the Biſhops. In the Council under *Hilarius*, *An.* 461. the Presbyters of *Rome* all ſat [*e*] together with the Biſhops, and the Deacons ſtood by them. So again in the Council under *Felix*, *An.* 487. [*f*] the Names of Seventy ſix Presbyters are mentioned that ſat together with the Biſhops in Council, the Deacons as before ſtanding by them. And in the Council under *Symmachus*, *An.* 499. Sixty ſeven Presbyters and ſix Deacons ſubſcribed in the very ſame [*g*] Form of Words as the Biſhops did. In another Council under the ſame *Symmachus*, *An.* 502. Thirty ſix Presbyters [*h*] are named, who ſat therein. And in the Council under *Gregory* the IId. *An.* 715. the Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons all ſubſcribe in the [*i*] ſame Form to the Decrees then publiſhed by them all together.

[*d*] Euſeb. lib. 10. c. 5. Συνδύξας σεαυτῷ καὶ δύο γέροντας τῶν ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ θρόνῳ. [*e*] Con. Rom. ap. Juſtel. Tom. 1. p. 250. Reſidentibus etiam univerſis Presbyteris, adſtantibus quoq; Diaconis *&c.* [*f*] Ibid. p. 255. [*g*] Ibid. p. 259. Subſcripſerunt Presbyteri numero, 67. Cælius Laurentius Archipresbyter Tituli Praxedis hic ſubſcripſi & conſenſi Synodalibus Conſtitutis, atq; in hac me profiteor manere Sententia, *&c* [*h*] Ibid. p 261. Reſidentibus etiam Presbyteris, Projectitio, Martino, *&c.* Adſtantibus quoq; Diaconis. [*i*] Ibid. p. 274. Siſinnius Presbyter huic Conſtituto, à nobis promulgato, ſubſcripſi. Petrus Archidiaconus huic Conſtituto, à nobis promulgato Subſcripſi. The

The like Inſtances may be ſeen in the firſt Councils [*k*] of *Toledo*, and *Bracara* [*l*], where we may alſo obſerve the difference made between Presbyters and Deacons; That the Presbyters are always repreſented as ſitting together with their Biſhops, but the Deacons only ſtanding by to attend them. All which notwithſtanding, *Cellotius* the Jeſuit, and ſome others of that Strain, have the Confidence to aſſert, that Presbyters were never allowed to ſit with Biſhops in their Councils. *Bellarmin* [*m*] does not go ſo far, but only denies them a Deciſive Voice there: In which Aſſertion he is oppoſed, not only by the generality of Proteſtant [*n*] Writers, but alſo by *Habertus* [*o*] and other Learned Defenders [*p*] of the *Gallican* Liberties in his own Communion. So that it is agreed on all hands by unprejudiced Writers, and curious ſearchers of Antiquity, that Presbyters had liberty to ſit and deliberate with Biſhops in Provincial Councils.

Sect. 13. *And in General Councils likewiſe.*

But as to General or Univerſal Councils, there are ſome Proteſtant Writers, who ſeem to make it a Diſpute, whether Presbyters anciently were allowed to ſit in them. A Learned Perſon [*q*] of our own Church ſays, It was never before heard of, that Prieſts did ſit in Oecumenical Councils, meaning, before the Council of *Lateran* under *Calliſtus* the Second, *Ann.* 1123. where 600 Abbots were preſent. But I ſee no reaſon why we

[*k*] Con. Tolet. 1. Convenientibus Epiſcopis in Eccleſia---Conſidentibus Presbyteris, adſtantibus Diaconis, &c. [*l*] Con. Bracar. 1. Conſidentibus ſimul Epiſcopis, præſentibus quoq; Presbyteris, adſtantibuſq; Miniſtris, vel univerſo Clero. [*m*] Bellarm. de Concil. lib. 1. c. 15. [*n*] Morton. Apol. Cathol. Part. 2. lib. 4. c. 8. Whitaker de Concil. Quæſt. 3. [*o*] Habertus Not. in lib. Pontif. Græcor. p. 175. [*p*] Ranchin *Review of the Council of* Trent. lib. 1. c. 8. [*q*] *Biſhop* Burnet's *Vindication of the Ordination*, &c. Pref. p. 32.

may not reckon the firſt Council of *Arles* a General Council, if a Multitude of Biſhops from from all Quarters can make it ſo: For there were 200 Biſhops preſent; and as I noted before, ſeveral Presbyters were ordered to come along with them. However the Council of *Conſtantinople*, *An.* 381. is reckoned by all a General Council (though there were but 150 Biſhops in it): And there we find three Presbyters together [*r*] ſubſcribing among the Biſhops alſo. The Learned *Habertius* [*s*] gives ſeveral other Inſtances out of the Council of *Chalcedon*, the Second Council of *Nice*, the Eighth Council called againſt *Photius*, and others. From all which, and what has here been alledged, it muſt be concluded, that Preſbyters had anciently the Privilege of Sitting and Voting alſo in General Councils.

Sect. 14.
Of the Titles of Honour given to Presbyters, as well as Biſhops, and what difference there was between them as applied to both.

Theſe Prerogatives of Presbyters, being thus allowed in ſo many Caſes to act in Conjunction with their Biſhops, advanced their Character and Reputation very high, and made them of great Eſteem in the Church: Inſomuch that many of the ſame Titles of Honour, which were given to Biſhops, were with a little Variation given to Presbyters alſo. Hence they are called πρέσβεις, by *Syneſius* [*t*] and *Euſebius*; πρεσβῶτες by *Nazianzen* [*u*] and *Baſil*; πρωτόθρονοι, by *Chryſoſtom* [*w*] and *Nazianzen* likewiſe: Which Names anſwer to the Titles of *Præpoſiti* and *Antiſtites* in *Latin*, and ſignify Preſidents, or Rulers and Governors of the People. I know indeed ſome

[*r*] Con. Conſtantin. Tom. 2. p. 957. Tyrannus Presbyter Amorii: Auxanon Presbyter Apameæ: Helladius Presbyter Commanenſis. [*s*] Habert. Not. in Pontif. p 175. [*t*] Syneſ. Ep. 32. Euſeb. lib. 10. c 4. [*u*] Naz. Orat. 1. Baſil. Reg. Moral. 71. [*w*] Chryſ. Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. 4. 1. Naz. Orat. 1. p. 37.

Learned

Learned Perſons [x] are of Opinion, that the Name *Antiſtes* is never given to any Presbyter by any ancient Writer. But this Aſſertion muſt be underſtood with a little Qualification: Otherwiſe it will not be exactly true: For *Hilarius Sardus* [y] ſpeaking of Presbyters, againſt whom a Biſhop is not to receive an Accuſation, but before two or three Witneſſes, gives them expreſly the Title of *Antiſtites Dei*. So does alſo the Author [z] of the Queſtions upon the Old and New Teſtament, under the Name of St. *Auſtin*. And though *Præpoſiti* in *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles commonly ſignifies Biſhops, yet it does not always ſo: For the Presbyters of *Rome* writing [a] to the Clergy of *Carthage*, ſtile themſelves *Præpoſiti*, and *Celerinus* [b] in his Epiſtle to *Lucian* gives them the ſame Title. But *Sidonius Apollinaris* [c] ſets this Matter right, when he teacheth us to diſtinguiſh between an *Antiſtes* of the firſt Order, and an *Antiſtes* of the ſecond; which Diſtinction, whenever Presbyters are called *Antiſtites*, if it be not expreſſed, is always to be underſtood. Therefore *Blondel* argues very looſly, when he would infer from this Community of Names and Titles, that Biſhops and Preſbyters were but one and the ſame Order. Which might as well be inferred from the Name, *Sacerdotes*, Prieſts, which ſo frequently occurs in the anci-

[x] Bevereg. Not. in Concil. Ancyr. c. 13. Neq; enim Presbyter unquam Antiſtes dicitur. [y] Ambroſ. al. Hilar. Com. in 1 Tim. 5. Hujus Ordinis ſublimis honor eſt; hujuſmodi enim Vicarii ſunt Chriſti: Idcirco non facile de hac Perſona Accuſatio debet admitti. Incredibile enim debet videri, iſtum qui Dei Antiſtes eſt, criminoſe verſatum. [z] Aug. Quæſt. Vet. & Nov. Teſt. c. 101. Propter quod Antiſtites Dei ſunt, in Domo Dei & in honore Chriſti cum dignitate conſiſtunt. [a] Ep. 3. al. 8. ap. Cyprian. Cum incumbat nobis qui videmur Præpoſiti eſſe, & vice Paſtoris cuſtodire Gregem. [b] Celerin. Ep. 21. ap. Cypr. Præceperunt eas Præpoſiti tantiſper ſic eſſe, donec Epiſcopus conſtituatur.

[c] Sidon. lib. 4. Ep. 11. Antiſtes fuit ordine in ſecundo, Fratrem faſce levans Epiſcopali.

ent

ent Writers; and as *Cyprian* obſerves, [*d*] denotes an Honour common both to Biſhops and Presbyters: Though when there was occaſion to ſpeak more accurately and diſtinctly of Biſhops, their Appropriate Title was that of *Summi Sacerdotes*, Chief Prieſts, to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe of the Inferior Order, as I have ſhewed before in ſpeaking of the Titles of Biſhops; to which I ſhall only add here the Teſtimony of *Optatus*, who [*e*] gives both Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, the Name of Prieſts, and their Office the Name of Prieſthood; but with this difference, that the Deacons were only in the third Degree of Prieſthood, and the Presbyters in the ſecond, but the Biſhops were the Heads and Chief of all. From whence it is plain, that if a bare Community of Names argued an Identity of Offices, one might as well infer, that Biſhops and Deacons, or Presbyters and Deacons were but one and the ſame Order, becauſe they ſhare in the ſame common Titles of Prieſt and Prieſthood.

Sect. 15. *In what ſenſe Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, called Prieſts by* Optatus.

If here it be enquired, as it is very natural to ask the Queſtion, Why *Optatus* gives all the three Orders of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, the Title of Prieſthood? The Anſwer is plain and obvious: Becauſe according to him every Order had its ſhare, though in different Degrees, in the Chriſtian Prieſthood. Which is not, as ſome imagine, a Power to offer Chriſt's Body and Blood really upon the Altar,

[*d*] Cypr. Ep. 58. al. 61. ad Lucium, p. 145. Presbyteri cum Epiſcopo ſacerdotali Honore conjuncti. [*e*] Optat. lib. 1. p. 39. Quid commemorem Diaconos in tertio? Quid Presbyteros in ſecundo Sacerdotio conſtitutos? Ipſi Apices & Principes omnium, aliqui Epiſcopi illis temporibus--Inſtrumenta Divinæ Legis impie tradiderunt. Confer. Hieron. Epiſt. 27. *Where he calls Presbyters* Secundi Ordinis Sacerdotes.

as

as a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead: (which is such a Notion of the Christian Priesthood, as no ancient Author or Ritual ever mentions): But it consists in a Power and Authority to minister publickly according to God's Appointment in Holy Things, or Things pertaining to God. And there are several Parts of this Power, according to the different Participation of which, in the Opinion of *Optatus*, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons had each their respective Share in the Priesthood. Thus it was one Act of the Priests Office to offer up the Sacrifice of the Peoples Prayers, Praises, and Thanksgivings to God, as their Mouth and Orator, and to make Intercession to God for them; another part of the Office was in God's Name to bless the People, particularly by admitting them to the Benefit and Privilege of Remission of Sins by Spiritual Regeneration or Baptism. And thus far Deacons were anciently allowed to minister in Holy Things, as Mediators between God and the People. Upon which Account a late Learned Writer [*f*] joins entirely with *Optatus*, in declaring Deacons to be Sharers in this lowest Degree of the Christian Priesthood. Above this was the Power of offering up to God the Peoples Sacrifices at the Altar; that is, as Mr. *Mede* [*g*] and others explain them, first the Eucharistical Oblations of Bread and Wine, to agnize or acknowledge God to be the Lord of the Creatures; then the Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving in Commemoration of Christ's Bloody Sacrifice upon the Cross, Mystically represented in the Creatures of Bread and Wine; which whole sacred Action was commonly called the Christians Reasonable and Unbloody Sacrifice, or the Sacrifice of the Altar. Now

[*f*] *Dr.* Hicks's *Discourse of the Christian Priesthood*, c. 2. §. 5. p. 33. [*g*] Mede Christ. Sacrif. c. 2. p. 356. Hicks ibid. p 49. *with many others cited by him.*

the

the Deacons (as we ſhall ſee in the next Chapter) were never allowed to offer theſe Oblations at the Altar, but it was always a peculiar Act of the Presbyters Office, which was therefore reckoned a ſuperior Degree of the Prieſthood. Another Act of the Prieſtly Office was to interpret the Mind and Will of God to the People; as alſo to bleſs them ſolemnly in his Name, and upon Confeſſion and Repentance grant them Miniſterial Abſolution: And theſe being alſo the ordinary Offices of Presbyters, they gave them a farther Title to the Prieſthood. All theſe Offices, and ſome more the * Biſhops could perform, ſuch as the ſolemn Conſecration or Benediction of Perſons ſet apart for the Miniſtry, *&c.* which together with their Spiritual Juriſdiction, or Power of Ruling and Governing the Church, as Vicars of Chriſt, gave them a Title to a yet higher Degree of the Chriſtian Prieſthood; whence as I noted before, they were called Chief Prieſts, *Primi Sacerdotes*, *Summi Sacerdotes*, *Principes Sacerdotum*, and *Pontifices Maximi.* I know indeed, *Albaſpiny* and ſeveral others of the *Roman* [*b*] Communion make a Diſtinction between the Prelatical and Sacerdotal Office in a Biſhop, which is invented to ſerve ſome peculiar Hypotheſes of their own; as 1*ſt*, That a Biſhop differs nothing from a Presbyter as he is a Prieſt; 2*dly*, That Biſhop and Presbyter are but one Sacerdotal Order; and 3*dly*, That the proper Notion and Specifick Character of the Sacerdotal Order, is a Power to offer Chriſt's Body and Blood, as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead: All which are contrary to the plain Senſe of Antiquity, which knew no ſuch Specifick Character of the Sacerdotal Order, nor ever dreamt of Biſhops and Presbyters

* Ἱερεργεῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Epiphanius *calls it.* Hær. 79. n. 3. *See before Chap.* 2. Sect. 6. [*b*] Bellarm. de Cleric. lib. 1. c. 11. Caniſius Catech. de Sacram. Ord. Sect. 4.

being

being but one Order in reference to the Prieſthood; but always ſpake of them as diſtinct Orders, and placed their Diſtinction in their enjoying different Powers of the Prieſthood, making Presbyters only the 2d Order, and 2d Prieſthood, *Secundus Ordo & Secundum Sacerdotium*, and Biſhops the firſt; and aſſerting that the Juridical Acts of a Biſhop, were alſo Sacerdotal, or Acts of a Superior Degree of the Chriſtian Prieſthood peculiar to his Order. St. *Cyprian* [*i*] ſcruples not to call ſuch Acts, *Sacerdotii Vigor*, the Vigor and Power of the Epiſcopal Prieſthood, ſpeaking of the Power and Juriſdiction which he had as the Prieſt of God, to puniſh Presbyters and Deacons that were under him; which he had improperly called the Power of his Prieſthood, had his Juriſdiction and Prieſthood been two different Powers in him. This may ſerve at once to caution the Reader againſt that ſubtle Diſtinction of the *Romaniſts*, and give him a ſhort Account both of the Nature, and different Degrees of the Chriſtian Prieſthood.

Sect. 16. *Why Prieſts called Mediators between God and Men.*

There is another Name frequently occurring in the *Greek* Writers, when they ſpeak of Chriſtian Prieſts, which will deſerve to be explained: That is the Name, μεσῖται Mediators between God and Men, a Title given them by the Author of the Conſtitutions [*k*], as alſo by *Origen*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Baſil*, *Iſidore* of *Peluſium*, and many others, whoſe Authorities are collected by [*l*] *Cotelerius*. The *Latin* Writers are more ſparing in the uſe of this Term: For except St. *Jerom*, *Cotelerius* could find none that uſed it. St. *Auſtin* is ſo far from uſing it, that he condemns it

[*i*] Cypr. Ep. 15. al. 20. p. 42. ed. Ox. [*k*] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 2. c. 25. [*l*] Coteler. Not. ibid.

[*m*] as

[*m*] as intolerable in *Parmenian* the *Donatiſt*, who had ſaid, That the Biſhop was Mediator between God and the People. And indeed there is a ſenſe in which it is intolerable to ſay, There is any other Mediator beſides one, the Man Chriſt Jeſus. But the *Greek* Fathers uſed the Word in a qualified Senſe, not for an Authentick Mediator, or Mediator of Redemption, who pleads his own Merits before God in the behalf of others; but only for a Mediator of Miniſterial Interceſſion, in which ſenſe ſome [*n*] of the Ancients think *Moſes* is called a Mediator by St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 3. 19. becauſe he was the *Internuncius* to relate the Mind of God to the People, and the Peoples Requeſts and Reſolutions to God again. And in this qualified ſenſe 'tis generally [*o*] owned that Chriſtian Prieſts may be called Mediators alſo, as thoſe that are appointed to convey the Peoples Devotions to God, and the Will and Bleſſing of God to the People.

Sect. 17. *The ancient Form and Manner of Ordaining Presbyters.*

Having thus far ſpoken of the ſeveral Offices and Titles of Preſbyters, it remains that I give a ſhort Account of the Form and Manner of their Ordination, by which they were inveſted with their Power, and authorized to perform the ſeveral Duties of their Function. Now as to this it is plain, the ancient Form was only Impoſition of Hands and a Conſecration-Prayer. Thus it is deſcribed in the Canon [*p*] of the Council of *Carthage*, which has been ci-

[*m*] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. 2. c. 8. Si Johannes diceret - - - - Mediatorem me habetis apud Patrem, & ego exoro pro peccatis veſtris (ſicut Parmenianus quodam loco poſuit Epiſcopum Mediatorem inter Populum & Deum) quis eum ferret bonorum atq; fidelium Chriſtianorum? [*n*] Baſil. de Spir. Sto. c. 14. Theodor. Com. in Gal. 3. 19. [*o*] *See Dr.* Potter, Ch Gov. c 5. p. 251. Coteler. Not. in Conſtit. lib. 2. c. 25. [*p*] Con. Carth. 4. c. 3. *cited before* §. 10.

ted

ted before, and in the Author under the Name of [q] *Dionyſius*, who repreſents it in this manner: He ſays, The Perſon to be ordained kneeled before the Biſhop at the Altar, and he laying his Hand upon his Head, did conſecrate him with an Holy Prayer, and then ſigned him with the Sign of the Croſs; after which the Biſhop and the reſt of the Clergy that were preſent, gave him the Kiſs of Peace. The Author of the Conſtitutions [r] ſpeaks alſo of Impoſition of Hands and Prayer, but no more. From which we may reaſonably conclude, that the Words which the *Roman* Church makes to be the moſt neceſſary and eſſential part of a Prieſt's Ordination, *viz.* *Receive thou Power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Maſs both for the Living and the Dead*, were not in any of the ancient Forms of Conſecration. One of their own * Writers, *Morinus*, after the moſt diligent ſearch he could make into theſe Matters, could find no Form for 900 years together, that made any mention of them. And for their other Ceremonies ſuperadded to the old ones, other Learned Writers of that Church do as ingeniouſly confeſs the Novelty of them. *Habertus* [s] proves againſt *Catumſiritus* that material Unction is a new thing, and not to be met with in any ancient Ordination; as neither is it in uſe in the *Greek* Church at this Day. So that when *Gregory Nazianzen* [t] and others ſpeak of an Unction, they are to be underſtood as ſpeaking Myſtically of the Spiritual Unction of the Holy Ghoſt. *Cabaſſutius* [u] obſerves the ſame of the Cuſtom of delivering the Sacred Veſſels into the Hands of the Perſon that was Ordained, that however ſome plead very ſtifly for its Antiquity, yet it is really

[q] Dionyſ. de Eccleſ. Hierarch. c. 5. part 2. p. 364. [r] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 16. * *See Biſhop* Burnet *of Ordination*, p. 24. *who cites* Morinus. [s] Habert. Obſerv. in Pontif. Græc. p. 386. [t] Naz. Orat. 5. p. 136. [u] Cabaſſut. Notit. Concil. c. 43.

but

but a modern Cuſtom: And he cites *Morinus* for the ſame Opinion. So that I need not ſtand to ſhew the Novelty of theſe things, which is ſo evidently proved, as well by the Confeſſion of theſe Learned Men, as by the Silence of all ancient Rituals. But there is one thing the Reader may be deſirous to know farther, *viz.* what Form of Words the Conſecration-Prayer was conceived in? To which I muſt anſwer, as I have done before about Biſhops, that there was no ſuch general Form then extant; but every Biſhop having Liberty to frame his own Liturgy, he uſed ſuch a Form as he thought convenient in his own Church: It being a thing indifferent, as a Learned Perſon [*w*] obſerves, ſo the Subſtance of the Bleſſing were preſerved. The only Form now remaining is that which is extant in the Conſtitutions, which becauſe it will ſhew the Reader what was then the Subſtance of the Benediction, I will here inſert the Words of it, which are theſe: *Look, O Lord, upon this thy Servant, who is choſen into the Preſbytery by the Suffrage and Judgment of all the Clergy, and fill him with the Spirit of Grace and Counſel, that he may help and govern thy People with a pure Heart: In like manner as thou hadſt reſpect to thy choſen People, commanding* Moſes *to make choice of Elders, whom thou didſt repleniſh with thy Spirit. And now, Lord, do the ſame thing, preſerving in us the never-failing Spirit of thy Grace: That he being full of healing Powers and inſtructive Diſcourſe, may with Meekneſs teach thy People, and ſerve thee ſincerely with a pure Mind, and willing Soul, and unblameably perform the ſacred* [*x*] *Services for thy People, through Chriſt*, &c. Where we may obſerve, that it was not then thought neceſſary to expreſs all or any of the Offices of a Presbyter in particular,

[*w*] *Biſhop* Burnet's *Vindication of the Ordination*, &c. p. 25.

[*x*] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 16. τὰς ἱερωσύνης τῦ λαῦ ἱερουργίας ἀμώμως ἐκτελῆ.

but

but only in general to pray for Grace to be given to the Prieſt then ordained, whereby he might be enabled to perform them. And this with a ſolemn Impoſition of Hands was reckoned a ſufficient Form of Conſecration. Which I note for the Inſtruction of thoſe, who may be apt to think that Modern Forms of Ordination are in every Circumſtance like the Primitive ones; whereas if *Morinus* ſay true, the Words which are now moſt in uſe, *viz.* Receive the Holy Ghoſt, were not in the *Roman* Pontifical above 400 Years ago. Which makes good the Obſervation of a Learned [*y*] Perſon, That the Church Catholick did never agree on one Uniform Ritual, or Book of Ordination, but that was ſtill left to the Freedom of particular Churches; and ſo the Church of *England* had as much Power to make or alter Rituals, as any other had.

Sect. 18. *Of the* Archipreſbyteri.

I ſhould here have ended this Chapter about Presbyters, but that it is neceſſary to give ſome Account of the *Archipresbyteri*, and *Seniores Eccleſiæ*, which are ſometimes mentioned in ancient Writers. The Archpresbyters are ſpoken of by St. *Jerom*, who ſeems [*z*] to ſay there was one, and but one in every Church; and perhaps he is the firſt Author that mentions them. After him *Socrates* [*a*] ſpeaks of one *Peter* Protopresbyter of *Alexandria*, whom *Sozomen* [*b*] calls Archpresbyter. And *Liberatus* [*c*] mentions one *Proterius* Archpresbyter in the ſame Church. From whom we alſo learn in ſome meaſure what was the Office and Quality of the

[*y*] *Biſhop* Burnet's *Vind. of the Ordin.* p. 35. [*z*] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Ruſtic. Singuli Eccleſiarum Epiſcopi, ſinguli Archipresbyteri, ſinguli Archidiaconi. [*a*] Socrat. lib. 6. c. 9. Πέτρος τὶς πρωτοπρεσβύτερος. [*b*] Sozom. lib. 8. c. 12. [*c*] Liberat. Breviar. c. 14. Proterio Dioſcorus commendavit Eccleſiam, qui & eum Archipresbyterum fecerat. In Edit. Crab. male legitur *Archiepiſcopum.*

Archpresbyter. He was not always the Senior Presbyter of the Church, as some are apt to imagine, but one chosen out of the College of Presbyters at the pleasure of the Bishop. For *Liberatus* says expressly, that *Dioscorus* the Bishop, made *Proterius* Archpresbyter of the Church: Which implies that he did not come to the Office by vertue of his Seniority, but by the Bishop's Appointment. As to his Office, it is plain from *Liberatus*, that it was to preside over the Church next under the Bishop, as chief of the College of Presbyters, and to take care of all things relating to the Church in the Bishop's Absence; as *Proterius* is said to have done, while *Dioscorus* went to the Council of *Chalcedon*. And therefore some [d] not without reason think these *Archipresbyteri* were much of the same nature with our Deans in Cathedral Churches, as the College of Presbyters were the Chapter. But they wholly mistake the Matter, who [e] confound these *Archipresbyteri* with the *Cardinales Presbyteri*. For that is a Name of much later Date, not to be found in any Genuine Writer till the time of *Gregory* the Great: For the Council of *Rome*, which is the only Authority that *Bellarmin* [f] alledges to prove it more ancient, is a mere Fiction. Besides that the Cardinal Presbyters were many in the same Church or City, but the Archpresbyter was but one. So that whatever was the first Original of Cardinal Presbyters; (whether they were so called from their being fixed in some principal Churches, where Baptism might be Administred, which were therefore called *Ecclesiæ vel Tituli Cardinales*, as *Bellarmin* thinks; Or whether, as others [g] imagine, when the Number of Presbyters was grown so great in large and populous Cities, that they could

[d] Stillingfl. Irenic. part. 2. c. 7. p. 358. [e] Onunphr. Interpret. Vocum Ecclesiast. Salmas. de Primat. c. 1. p. 10.
[f] Bellar. de Cleric. lib. 1. c. 16. [g] Stillingfl. ibid.

not

not conveniently meet, and join with the Bishop, for ordering the Government of the Church, there were some as the chief of them chosen out from the rest, to be as the Bishop's Council, who were therefore called *Cardinales Presbyteri*; a Dispute that does not concern me any farther to enquire into or determine:) I say, whatever was their Rise, or the reason of their Name, it is certain they were not the same with the *Archipresbyteri* of the Primitive Church.

Sect. 19. *Of the* Seniores Ecclesiastici. *That these were not Lay-Elders in the Modern Acceptation.*

As to the *Seniores Ecclesiæ*, they were a sort of Elders, who were not of the Clergy, yet had some concern in the care of the Church. The Name often occurs in *Optatus* and St. *Austin*, from whom we may easily learn the Nature of their Office. *Optatus* says [*b*], when *Mensurius* Bishop of *Carthage* was forced to leave his Church in the time of the *Diocletian* Persecution, he committed the Ornaments and Utensils of the Church to such of the Elders as he could trust, *Fidelibus Senioribus commendavit*. Upon which *Albaspiny* [*i*] notes, that besides the Clergy there were then some Lay-Elders, who were entrusted to take care of the Goods of the Church. At the end of *Optatus* there is a Tract called, The Purgation of *Felix* and *Cæcilian*, wherein there are several Epistles that make mention of the same Name, as that of *Fortis* [*k*] and *Purpurius*, and ano-

[*b*] Optat. lib. 1. p. 41. [*i*] Albaspin. Not. in Optat. p. 123. Præter Ecclesiasticos & Clericos quidam ex Plebe Seniores & probatæ vitæ res Ecclesiæ curabant. [*k*] Gesta Purgat. Cæcil. & Fel. p. 268. ex Epist. Fortis: Omnes vos Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diacones, Seniores, Scitis, *&c.* Ibid. ex Epist. Purpurii: Adhibete Conclericos, & seniores Plebis, Ecclesiasticos Viros, & inquirant diligenter, quæ sunt istæ Dissensiones. Ibid. Clericis & senioribus Cirthensium in Domino æternam salutem.

ther nameleſs Author. St. *Auſtin* inſcribes one of his Epiſtles [*l*] to his own Church of *Hippo* in this manner, *Clero, Senioribus, & univerſæ Plebi,* To the Clergy, the Elders, and all the People: And in ſeveral other places [*m*] has occaſion to mention theſe *Seniores* in other Churches.

From whence ſome [*n*] have concluded, that theſe were Ruling Lay-Elders, according to the new Model and modern Acceptation. Whereas, as the Ingenious Author [*o*] of the Humble Remonſtrance rightly obſerves in his Reply, thoſe *Seniores* of the Primitive Church were quite another thing. Some of them were the Optimates, the chief Men or Magiſtrates of the Place, ſuch as we ſtill call Aldermen, from the ancient Appellation of *Seniores.* Theſe are thoſe which the *Cabarſieſſitan* Council of *Donatiſts* in St. *Auſtin* calls [*p*] *Seniores Nobiliſſimi*; and one of the Councils [*q*] of *Carthage* more expreſly, *Magiſtratus vel Seniores locorum,* The Magiſtrates or Elders of every City; whom the Biſhops were to take with them to give the *Donatiſts* a Meeting. In this Senſe Dr. *Hammond* [*r*] obſerves from Sir *Henry Spelman,* and ſome of our *Saxon* Writings, that anciently our *Saxon* Kings had the ſame Title of Elders, *Aldermanni, Presbyteri,* and *Seniores.* As in the *Saxon* Tranſlation of the Bible, the Word, *Princes,* is commonly rendered Aldermen. And of this ſort were ſome of thoſe *Seniores Eccleſiæ,* that

[*l*] Aug. Ep. 137. [*m*] Id. cont. Creſcon. lib. 3. c. 29, & 56. Concio 2. in Pſal. 36. p. 120. [*n*] Smectymn. *Anſwer to the Remonſtrance,* p. 74. [*o*] Hamon l'Eſtrange *Defence of the Remonſtrance.* [*p*] Aug. Conc. 2. in Pſal. 36. p. 120. [*q*] Con. Carthag. an. 403. in Con. Aphrican. c. 58. & in Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr. c. 91. Debere unumquemq; noſtrum in Civitate ſua per ſe convenire Donatiſtarum Præpoſitos, aut adjungere ſibi vicinum Collegam, ut pariter eos in ſingulis quibuſq; Civitatibus vel Locis, per Magiſtratus vel Seniores Locorum conveniant.

[*r*] Ham. Diſſert. 4. cont. Blondel. c. 19. n. 1.

have

have been mentioned, whoſe Advice and Aſſiſtance alſo, no doubt, the Biſhops took in many weighty Affairs of the Church. The other ſort, which were more properly called *Seniores Eccleſiaſtici*, were ſuch as were ſometimes truſted with the Utenſils, Treaſure, and outward Affairs of the Church; and may be compared to our Church-Wardens, Veſtry-men, Stewards, who have ſome Care of the Affairs of the Church, but are not concerned as Ruling-Elders in the Government or Diſcipline thereof. Now Lay-Elders are a Degree above the Deacons; but the *Seniores Eccleſiæ* were below them: Which is a farther Evidence, that they were not Lay-Elders in the Modern Acceptation. But of this enough. I now proceed to conſider the third Order of the Clergy in the Primitive Church, which is that of Deacons.

CHAP. XX.

Of Deacons.

Sect. 1. *Deacons always reckoned one of the three Sacred Orders of the Church.*

THE Name Διάκονοι, which is the Original Word for Deacons, is ſometimes uſed in the *New Teſtament* for any one that Miniſters in the Service of God: In which large Senſe we ſometimes find Biſhops and Presbyters ſtiled Deacons, not only in the [a] *New Teſtament*, but in Eccleſiaſtical Writers [b] alſo. But here we take it in a more ſtrict Senſe for the Name of the Third Order of the Clergy of the Primitive Church. In treating of which it will be neceſſary in the firſt place to ſhew the Senſe of Antiquity con-

[a] Act. 1. 25. 2 Cor. 6. 4. 2 Tim. 4. 5. 1 Cor. 3. 5. Eph. 3. 7.
[b] Athan. cont. Gent. Chryſoſt. Hom. 1. in Phil. 1. 1.

cerning their Original. The Council of *Trullo* advances a very ſingular Notion about this Matter, aſſerting, that the ſeven Deacons ſpoken of in the *Acts*, are not to be underſtood of ſuch as miniſtred [*c*] in Divine Service or the Sacred Myſteries, but only of ſuch as ſerved Tables and attended the Poor. But the whole Current of Antiquity runs againſt this: *Ignatius* [*d*] ſtiles them expreſly Miniſters of the Myſteries of Chriſt, adding, That they are not Miniſters of Meats and Drinks, but of the Church of God. In another [*e*] place he ſpeaks of them as Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, and gives them a ſort of Preſidency over the People, together with the Biſhop and Presbyters: Study to do all things, ſays he, in Divine Concord, under your Biſhop preſiding in the Place of God, and the Presbyters in the Place of the Apoſtolical Senate, and the Deacons moſt dear to me, as thoſe to whom is committed the Miniſtry of Jeſus Chriſt. And in many other [*f*] places he requires the People to be ſubject to them, and reverence them as Jeſus Chriſt, that is, as his Miniſters attending on his Service. *Cyprian* ſpeaks of them in the ſame Stile, calling them [*g*] Miniſters of Epiſcopacy and the Church; withal referring their Original to the place in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, which the Council of *Trullo* diſputes about, at the ſame time that he aſſerts [*h*] they were called *ad Altaris Miniſterium*, to the Miniſtry and Service of the Altar. *Tertullian* [*i*] was ſo far from thinking them only Miniſters of Meats and Drinks,

[*c*] Conc. Trull. c. 16. Ἐπὶ διακόνους μὴ ὅτι τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων διακονουμένων λαμβάνειν. [*d*] Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. n 2. [*e*] Epiſt. ad Magneſ. n. 6. [*f*] Epiſt. ad Polycarp. n. 6. Ep. ad Trall. n. 3.

[*g*] Cypr. Ep. 65. al. 3. ad Rogatian. Diaconos poſt aſcenſum Domini in cœlos Apoſtoli ſibi conſtituerunt Epiſcopatus ſui & Eccleſiæ Miniſtros. [*h*] Id. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Pleb. Legion. & Aſtur. p. 172. [*i*] Tert. de Fuga, c. 11. Quum ipſi Autores, id eſt, ipſi Diaconi, Presbyteri & Epiſcopi fugiunt, quomodo Laicus intelligere poterit, &c. Cum Duces fugiunt, quis de gregario numero ſuſtinebit?

that

that he joins them with Biſhops and Deacons in the honourable Titles of Guides and Leaders to the Laity, and makes them in their Degree Paſtors and Overſeers of the Flock of Chriſt. And ſo St *Jerom*, though he ſometimes in an angry Humour ſpeaks a little contemptuouſly of them, ſtiling them [k] Miniſters of Widows and Tables; yet in other places [l] he treats them with greater Reſpect, giving them the ſame honourable Title as *Tertullian* does, and ranking them among the Guides of the People. I ſhewed before in the laſt Chapter, that *Optatus* [m] had ſo great an Opinion of them, as to reckon their Office a lower Degree of the Prieſthood. And St. *Auſtin* ſeems to have had the ſame Sentiments: For in one of his Epiſtles [n] he gives *Præſidius* the Title of *Conſacerdos*, his Fellow-Prieſt, whom yet St. *Jerom* in the next Epiſtle [o] calls a Deacon.

Sect. 2.
Yet not generally called Prieſts, but Miniſters and Levites.

Yet here that I may not ſeem to impoſe upon my Readers, I muſt obſerve that the Name of Prieſts was not generally given to the Deacons, by thoſe that eſteemed them a Sacred Order; but they are commonly diſtinguiſhed from Prieſts by the Names of Miniſters and Levites. Thus St. *Jerom* [p] diſtinguiſhes them from the Prieſts of the ſecond Order, that is, from the Presbyters, by the Title of Levites. The Author of the Queſtions [q] upon the *Old* and *New Teſtament* under the Name of St. *Auſtin*, and *Hilarius Sardus* [r] under the Name of St. *Ambroſe*. are more

[k] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. & Com. in Ezek. c. 48. Menſarum & Viduarum Miniſtri. [l] Id. Com. in Mich. 7. Nolite credere in Ducibus, non in Epiſcopo, non in Presbytero, non in Diacono. [m] Optat. Lib. 1. [n] Aug. Ep. 16. [o] Hieron. Ep. 17. inter Epiſt. Aug. [p] Hieron. Ep 27. Epiſcopi, & Sacerdotum inferioris gradus, ac Levitarum innumerabilis multitudo. [q] Aug. Quæſt. Vet. & N. Teſt. T. 4 Q 46 Nunquid Diaconus poteſt vicem gerere Sacerdotis. —— Sacerdotis vicem agere non poteſt, qui non eſt Sacerdos. [r] Hilar. Com. in Epheſ. 4. Evangeliſtæ Diaconi ſunt, ſicut fuit Philippus, quamvis non ſint Sacerdotes.

positive and expreſs in denying them the Name of Prieſts. And *Salvian* [*s*] though he acknowledges their Miniſtration and Function to be about Holy Things, yet he gives them but the ſame Title of Levites, and that in Contradiſtinction to the Prieſts. And ſo frequently in the Councils [*t*] the Names, *Sacerdos* and *Levita*, are uſed as the peculiar diſtinguiſhing Titles of Presbyters and Deacons. The Fourth Council of *Carthage* [*u*] ſpeaks more expreſly, That Deacons are not ordained to the Prieſthood, but only to the Miniſtring Office, or Inferior Service. And hence the Canons ſometimes give them the Name of Ὑπηρέτης and *Miniſtri*, the Miniſters and Servants, not only of the Church, but of the Biſhops and Presbyters, as may be ſeen in the Council [*w*] of *Nice*, and *Carthage* [*x*], and many others. Whence ſome Learned Men [*y*] conclude againſt *Optatus* and St. *Auſtin*, that Deacons were in no ſenſe allowed to be Prieſts; whilſt others [*z*] with *Optatus*, diſtinguiſh the ſeveral Degrees of the Prieſthood, and reckon that though Deacons were not abſolutely called Prieſts, becauſe that was the appropriate Title of Biſhops and Presbyters, whoſe Miniſters and Attendants they were; yet Deacons ſometimes performed ſuch Offices, as did entitle them to a lower Degree of the Prieſthood. Having thus fairly ſtated and repreſented the Matter on both ſides, I muſt leave the Judicious Reader to determine for himſelf which Opinion has the ſtrongeſt Reaſons, whilſt I proceed to give an Account of the

[*s*] Salvian. ad Eccleſ. Cathol. Lib. 2. p. 394. Levitis ac Sacerdotibus tanta divinarum rerum adminiſtratione fungentibus.

[*t*] Con. Turon. 1. can. 2. [*u*] Con. Carth. 4. c. 4. Diaconus non ad Sacerdotium, ſed ad Miniſterium conſecratur. [*w*] Con. Nic. c. 18. Τῶ μὲ ὀπισκόπω ὑπηρέτη εἰσίν. [*x*] Con. Carth. 4. c. 37. Diaconus ita ſe Presbyteri, ut Epiſcopi, Miniſtrum eſſe cognoſcat. Vid. Con. Eliber. in Titulis can. 18. & 33. Con. Turon. 1. c. 1. [*y*] Bp. Fell Not. in Cypr. Ep. 18. Habert. Not. in Pontific p. 125. [*z*] Rigalt. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 13. *Dr.* Hicks *Diſc. concernnig Prieſthood*, p. 33.

Or-

Ordination of Deacons, and their ſeveral Offices, and ſuch Laws and Rules as concerned their Order.

Sect. 3. *For this Reaſon the Biſhop was not tied to have the Aſſiſtance of any Presbyters to ordain them.*

The Ordination of a Deacon differed from that of a Presbyter, both in the Form and Manner of it, and alſo in the Gifts and Powers that were conferred thereby. For in the Ordination of a Presbyter, as has been noted before, the Presbyters who were preſent were required to join in the Impoſition of Hands with the Biſhop: But the Ordination of a Deacon might be performed by the Biſhop alone, becauſe as the Council of *Carthage* [*a*] words it, he was ordained not to the Prieſthood, but to the Inferior Services of the Church. Theſe Services are not particularly mentioned in the Form of Ordination now remaining in the Conſtitutions; but there the Biſhop only prays in general, That God would [*b*] make his Face to ſhine upon that his Servant, who was then choſen to the Office of a Deacon, and fill him with his Holy Spirit and Power, as he did *Stephen* the Martyr; that he behaving himſelf acceptably and uniformly and unblameably in his Office, might be thought worthy of an higher Degree, *&c.* What therefore were the particular Offices of the Deacons, we are to learn not from the Forms of the Church, but from other Writers.

Sect. 4. *The Deacons Office to take care of the Utenſils of the Altar.*

Where we find firſt, that the moſt ordinary and common Office of the Deacons was to be ſubſervient and aſſiſtant to the Biſhop and Presbyters in the Service of the Altar. It belonged to them to take care of the

[*a*] Con. Carth. 4. c. 4. Diaconus quum ordinatur, ſolus Epiſcopus qui eum benedicit, manum ſuper caput illius ponat. Quia non ad Sacerdotium, ſed ad Miniſterium conſecratur.

[*b*] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 18.

Holy

Holy Table, and all the Ornaments and Utenſils appertaining thereto. The Author under the Name of St. *Auſtin* [c] takes notice of this as the common Office of Deacons in all Churches, except in ſuch great Churches as the Church of *Rome*, where there being a Multitude of Inferior Clergy, this Office was devolved on ſome of them: But in other Churches it was the Deacons Office, where the Inferior Clergy, Subdeacons, *&c.* were prohibited by Canon to come into the Sanctuary, or touch any of the Sacred Veſſels in the time of Divine Service, as may be ſeen in ſeveral Canons [d] of the ancient Councils.

Sect. 5. 2dly, *To receive the Oblations of the People, and preſent them to the Prieſt, and recite the Names of thoſe that offered.*

Another part of the Deacons Office was to receive the Peoples Offerings, and preſent them to the Prieſt, who preſented them to God at the Altar: After which the Deacon repeated the Names of thoſe that offered, publickly; And this Rehearſal was commonly called, *Offerre nomina*, as may be ſeen in *Cyprian*, who [e] ſpeaks of it as part of the Communion-Service of thoſe Times; which is alſo noted by *Rigaltius* [f] and others; of which Cuſtom I ſhall ſay more hereafter, when we come to treat of the ancient Service of the Church: At preſent I only obſerve, that this Recital of the Names of ſuch as made their Oblations, was part of the Deacons Office, as is evident from

[c] Aug. Quæſt. Vet. & Nov. Teſtment. Tom. 4. c. 101. Ut autem non omnia miniſteria obſequiorum per ordinem agant, multitudo facit Clericorum. Nam utique & Altare portarent, & vaſa ejus, & aquam in manus funderent Sacerdoti, ſicut videmus per omnes Eccleſias. [d] Con. Agathen. c. 66. Non oportet in ſacratos Miniſtros licentiam habere, in Secretarium (quod Græci Diaconicon appellant) ingredi & contingere Vaſa Dominica. Con Laodic. c. 21. cum Notis Balſamon. & Zonar. in loc.

[e] Cypr. Ep. 10. al. 16. p. 37. Ad communicationem admittuntur, & offertur Nomen eorum, &c. [f] Rigalt. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 60. Bona Rer. Liturg. Lib. 2. c. 8. n. 7.

St. Je-

St. *Jerom*, who tells us [g] that Extortioners and Oppreſſors made their Oblations out of their ill-gotten Goods, that they might glory in their Wickedneſs, while the Deacon in the Church publickly recites the Names of thoſe that offered: Such an one offers ſo much, ſuch an one has promiſed ſo much: And ſo they pleaſe themſelves with the Applauſe of the People, while their Conſcience ſecretly laſhes and torments them. Some indeed deny that there was any ſuch Cuſtom as this publick and particular Rehearſal of Mens Names that offered in the Church, and by conſequence that this was any part of the Deacons Office: But I think St. *Jerom*'s Teſtimony is undeniable Proof, and cannot otherwiſe be expounded, to make any tolerable Senſe of his Words: For which Reaſon I have made this one part of the Deacons Office, though contrary to the Judgment of ſome Learned Men.

Sect. 6. 3dly, *To read the Goſpel in ſome Churches.*

3*dly*, In ſome Churches, but not in all, the Deacons read the Goſpel both in the Communion Service, and before it alſo. The Author of the Conſtitutions aſſigns all other Parts of Scripture to the Readers, but the Goſpel is to be read [h] only by a Presbyter or a Deacon. St. *Jerom* intimates [i] that it was part of the Deacons Function; and ſo it is ſaid by the Council of *Vaiſon*, which authorizes Deacons to read the Homilies of the ancient Fathers in the abſence of a Presbyter, aſſigning this Reaſon for it: If the Deacons be wor-

[g] Hieron. Com. in Ezek. 18. p. 537. Multos conſpicimus qui opprimunt per potentiam, vel furta committunt, ut de multis parva pauperibus tribuant, & in ſuis ſceleribus glorientur, publiceque Diaconus in Eccleſia recitet Offerentium Nomina: Tantum offert ille, tantum ille pollicitus eſt, placentque ſibi ad Plauſum populi, torquente Conſcientia. [h] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 57. [i] Hieron. Ep. 57. ad Sabin. Evangelium Chriſti quaſi Diaconus lectitabas.

thy

thy to read [k] the Diſcourſes of Chriſt in the Goſpel, why ſhould they not be thought worthy to read the Expoſitions of the Holy Fathers? This implies that in the Weſtern Churches it was the ordinary Office of the Deacons to read the Goſpels. But in other Churches the Cuſtom varied: For as *Sozomen* obſerves, it was cuſtomary at *Alexandria* for the Archdeacon only to read the Goſpels, in other Churches the Deacons, in others the Prieſts only, and in ſome Churches on high Feſtivals the Biſhop himſelf read, as at *Conſtantinople* on *Eaſter-Day*. In the *African* Churches, in the time of *Cyprian*, the Readers were allowed to read the Goſpels as well as other parts of Scripture, as appears from one of *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles, where ſpeaking of *Celerinus* the Confeſſor, whom he had ordained a Reader, he ſays, It was fitting he ſhould be advanced to the Pulpit [l] or Tribunal of the Church (as they then called the Reading-desk) that he might thence read the Precepts and Goſpels of his Lord, which he himſelf like a courageous Confeſſor had followed and obſerved. So that we are not to look upon this to have been the Deacon's peculiar Office, but only in ſome Churches and ſome Ages.

Sect. 7. 4thly, *To Miniſter the conſecrated Elements of Bread and Wine to the People in the* Euchariſt.

But it was ſomething more appropriate to them to aſſiſt the Biſhop or Presbyters in the Adminiſtration of the *Euchariſt*: Where their Buſineſs was to diſtribute the Elements to the People that were preſent, and carry them to thoſe

[k] Con. Vaſenſ. 2. c. 2. Si digni ſunt Diaconi, quæ Chriſtus in Evangelio locutus eſt legere, quare indigni judicentur Sanctorum Patrum Expoſitiones publice recitare? [l] Cypr. Ep. 34. al. 39. Quid aliud quam ſuper Pulpitum, id eſt, ſuper Tribunal Eccleſiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celſitate ſubnixus---legat Præcepta & Evangelia Domini, quæ fortiter ac fideliter ſequitur.

that

that were abſent alſo, as *Juſtin Martyr* [m] acquaints us in his 2*d*. Apology. The Author of the Conſtitutions [n] likewiſe deſcribing the Manner of the ancient Service, divides the whole Action between the Biſhop and the Deacon; appointing the Biſhop to deliver the Bread to every Communicant ſingly, ſaying, The Body of Chriſt: And the Deacon in like manner to deliver the Cup, ſaying, The Blood of Chriſt, the Cup of Life. This the Author under the Name of St. *Auſtin* [o] calls the proper Office of the Deacons Order. Yet it was not ſo proper to their Order, but that they were to depend upon the Will and Licenſe of the Biſhop and the Presbyters, if they were preſent, as is expreſly provided in ſome of the ancient [p] Councils, which forbid the Deacon to give the *Euchariſt* in the preſence of a Preſbyter, except Neceſſity require, and he have his leave to do it. And therefore it was looked upon as a great Abſurdity for a Presbyter to ſit by and receive the Sacrament from the Hands of a Deacon, as was ſometimes practiced, but the Council of *Nice* [q] made a ſevere Canon againſt it. So that what was allowed to Deacons, was not to Conſecrate the *Euchariſt*, but only to diſtribute it, and that not to the Biſhop or Presbyters, but only to the People. Yet this Action of theirs is ſometimes called Oblation or Offering, as in *Cyprian* [r], and the Council of *Ancyra* [s], which forbids ſome Deacons that were under Cenſure, ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφερεῖν, to offer either the Bread or Wine, as Deacons otherwiſe were allowed to do.

[m] Juſt. M. Apol. 2. p. 97. [n] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 13.

[o] Aug. Quæſt. Vet. & Nov. Teſt. c. 101. Diaconi Ordo eſt accipere à Sacerdote, & ſic dare Plebi. [p] Con. Carth. 4. 38. Diaconus, præſente Presbytero, Euchariſtiam Corporis Chriſti populo ſi neceſſitas cogat, juſſus eroget. Vid. Con. Arelat. 2. c. 15.

[q] Con. Nic. can. 18. [r] Cypr. de Lapſis, p. 132. ſolemnibus adimpletis Calicem Diaconus offerre præſentibus cœpit.

[s] Conc. Ancyr. c. 2. Some

Sect. 8. *But not allowed to Conſecrate them at the Altar.*

Some Learned [*t*] Perſons, I know, put a different Senſe upon the Words of this Council: They underſtand by Offering, Conſecration, and thence conclude, That Deacons anciently were inveſted with the ordinary Power of Conſecrating the *Euchariſt* in the abſence of the Presbyters. But this is more than can fairly be deduced from the Words, which are capable of two more reaſonable Conſtructions: Either they may ſignifie the Deacons offering the Peoples Oblations to the Prieſt, which was a part of their Office, as I ſhewed before: And ſo *Petavius* [*u*] and *Habertus* underſtand them: Or elſe they may be interpreted by *Cyprian*'s Words, who expreſſes himſelf more fully, calling it offering the Conſecrated Bread and Wine to the People; which ſeems to be the moſt natural Senſe; and is preferred to all others by ſome late Learned [*w*] Writers. Whatever it be, there is no reaſon to believe it means that Deacons were allowed the ordinary Power of Conſecration. For the Council of *Nice*, which was not long after the Council of *Ancyra*, ſays expreſly [*x*], that Deacons had not Power to offer; that is, in the Senſe in which Offering ſignifies Conſecration: For in that Senſe it was the proper Office of Presbyters. Some Deacons indeed did about this time take upon them thus to offer, but the Council of *Arles*, which was held in the ſame Year with that of *Ancyra*, reckons it a Preſumption and Tranſgreſſion of their Rule, and therefore made a new [*y*] Canon to reſtrain them. St.

[*t*] Hoſpin. Hiſt. Sacram. lib. 2. c. 1. p. 23. [*u*] Petav. Diatrib. de Poteſt. Conſecr. c. 3. T. 4 p. 211. Habert in Pontifical. Par. 9. Obſerv. 2. p. 190. [*w*] Suicer. Theſaur. Tom. 1. p. 871. [*x*] Con. Nic. c. 18. τοὺς διακόνους μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, &c. [*y*] Con. Arelat. 1. c. 15. De Diaconibus, quos cognovimus multis locis offerre, placuit minime fieri debere.

Hilary

Hilary is a good Witneſs of the Practice of the Church in his own time, and he aſſures us there could be no Sacrifice, or Conſecration of the *Euchariſt* without a Presbyter [z]. And St. *Jerom* ſays the ſame [a], That Presbyters were the only Perſons, whoſe Prayers Conſecrated Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt. For which reaſon, ſpeaking of one *Hilary* a Deacon, he ſays, he could not Conſecrate the *Euchariſt* [b] becauſe he was only a Deacon. The Reaſon of this was, becauſe the Holy *Euchariſt* was looked upon as the prime Chriſtian Sacrifice, and one of the higheſt Offices of the Chriſtian Prieſthood: And Deacons being generally reckoned no Prieſts, or but in the loweſt Degree, they were therefore forbidden to Offer or Conſecrate this Sacrifice at the Altar. This Reaſon is aſſigned by the Author [c] of the Conſtitutions, and the Author under the Name of St. *Auſtin*, and ſeveral others.

But there is a Paſſage in St. *Ambroſe*, which ſeems to intimate that in the Third Century the Deacons at *Rome* had Power to Conſecrate the *Euchariſt*: For ſpeaking of *Laurentius* the Deacon, he brings him in thus addreſſing himſelf to *Sixtus* his Biſhop, as he was going to his Martyrdom: Whither go you, Holy Prieſt, without your Deacon? You did not uſe to offer Sacrifice without your Miniſter. Why are you then now diſpleaſed with me? Why may I not be Partner with you in ſhedding my Blood, who was

[z] Hilar. Fragm. p. 129. Sacrificii opus ſine Presbytero eſſe non potuit. [a] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Quid patitur Menſarum & Viduarum Miniſter, ut ſupra eos tumidus ſe efferat, ad quorum Preces Chriſti corpus & ſanguis conficitur? [b] Id. Dial. cont. Lucif. p. 145. Hilarius cum Diaconus de Eccleſia receſſerit, ſoluſque ut putat turba ſit Mundi: Neque Euchariſtiam conficere poteſt, Epiſcopos & Presbyteros non habens, &c. [c] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 28. Aug. Quæſt. Vet. & Nov. Teſt. Q. 46.

uſed

uſed to Conſecrate [*d*] the Blood of Chriſt by your Commiſſion, and be your Partner in Conſummating the Holy Myſteries? *Baronius* was ſo perplexed with this Difficulty, that he reſolves it to be a Corruption of the Text, and that inſtead of *Conſecrationem*, it ſhould be read [*e*] *Diſpenſationem*: And ſome ſhameleſs Editors have, without any grounds, made bold to foiſt this Correction into the Text: Which *Bona* [*f*] and *Habertus* ingenuouſly condemn, as done againſt the Authority of all the MSS. as well as former Editions, and that without any reaſon for it from the difficulty of the Expreſſion. For the Word, Conſecration, in this Place does not ſignify the Sacramental Conſecration of the Elements by Prayer at the Altar, which was performed by the Biſhop himſelf, as appears evidently from the Context, where it is ſaid, The Biſhop was never uſed to offer Sacrifice without his Miniſter or Deacon: Therefore the Conſecration which was committed to the Deacon, muſt be of another ſort: For he could not offer or conſecrate the Elements on the Altar in the Biſhop's Preſence, and at the ſame time that the Biſhop himſelf Conſecrated; but he might aſſiſt him, or bear a part with him, as it is there worded, in Conſummating the Holy Myſteries; that is, in giving the Cup with the uſual Form of Words to the People; which in the Language of thoſe Times, was called a Miniſterial Conſecration, or Conſummation of the Sacrament; foraſmuch as the Receivers were hereby Conſecrated with the

[*d*] Ambroſ. de Offic. lib. 1. c. 41. Quo Sacerdos ſancte ſine Diacono properas? Nunquam ſacrificium ſine Miniſtro offerre conſueveras. Quid in me ergo diſplicuit Pater?——Cui commiſiſti Dominici ſanguinis Conſecrationem, cui conſummandorum Conſortium Sacramentorum, huic Conſortium tui ſanguinis negas? [*e*] Baron. an. 261. n. 7. [*f*] Bona Rer. Liturg. lib. 1. c. 25. n. 4. Habert. Not. in Pontifical. Græc. p. 191.

Blood

Blood of Chriſt, and alſo conſummated or made perfect Partakers of the Sacrament in both kinds, having received the Bread from the Hands of the Biſhop, and the Cup from the Hands of the Deacon. This is plainly the Conſecration here ſpoken of, which refers only to the Deacon's Miniſtring of the Cup to the People, which was their uſual Office, and ſo cannot be made an Argument, as *Hoſpinian*, and *Grotius* [g] would have it, that Deacons were allowed to conſecrate the *Euchariſt* at the Altar.

Sect. 9.

5. Deacons allowed to Baptize in ſome Places.

But for the other Sacrament of Baptiſm, it is more evident, that they were permitted in ſome Caſes to adminiſter it ſolely. For though the Author [h] of the Conſtitutions ſays, that the Deacons did neither Baptize, nor Offer: And *Epiphanius* [i] affirms univerſally, that the Deacons were not entruſted with the ſole Adminiſtration of any Sacrament: Yet it appears from other Writers, that they had this Power, at leaſt in ſome places, ordinarily conferr'd upon them. *Tertullian* [k] inveſts them with the ſame Right as Presbyters, that is, to Baptize by the Biſhop's Leave. And St. *Jerom* [l] entitles them to the very ſame Privilege. The Council of *Eliberis* [m] as plainly aſſerts this Right, when it ſays, If a Deacon, that takes care of a People without either Biſhop or Presbyter, baptizes any, the Biſhop ſhall conſummate them by

[g] Vid. Grot. de Cœnæ Adminiſtratione ubi Paſtores non ſunt. *Cited and Confuted by* Petavius. [h] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 28.

[i] Epiphan. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 4. [k] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Dandi quidem habet jus ſummus Sacerdos, qui eſt Epiſcopus; dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen ſine Epiſcopi auctoritate, *&c.* [l] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. c. 4. p. 139. Inde venit, ut ſine juſſione Epiſcopi, neq; Presbyter neq; Diaconus jus habeant Baptizandi. [m] Concil. Eliber. c. 77. Si quis Diaconus, regens Plebem ſine Epiſcopo vel Presbytero, aliquos baptizaverit, Epiſcopus eos per Benedictionem perficere debebit.

his Benediction. This plainly ſuppoſes, that Deacons had the ordinary Right of Baptizing in ſuch Churches over which they preſided. So when *Cyril* [*n*] directs his *Catechumens*, how they ſhould behave themſelves at the time of Baptiſm, when they came either before a Biſhop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, in City or in Village: This may be preſumed a fair Intimation, that then Deacons were ordinarily allowed to miniſter Baptiſm in Country Places. I ſpeak only now of their ordinary Power. For as to extraordinary Caſes, not only Deacons, but the Inferior Clergy, and Lay-men alſo were admitted to Baptize in the Primitive Church, as will be ſhewed in its proper place.

Sect. 10.

6. Deacons to bid Prayer in the Congregation.

Another Office of the Deacons was to be a ſort of Monitors and Directors to the People in the Exerciſe of their Publick Devotions in the Church. To which purpoſe they were wont to uſe certain known Forms of Words, to give notice when each part of the Service began, and to excite the People to join attentively therein; alſo to give notice to the Catechumens, Penitents, Energumens, when to come up and make their Prayers, and when to depart; and in ſeveral Prayers they repeated the Words before them, to teach them what they were to pray for. All this was called by the general Name of κηρύττειν, among the *Greeks*, and *Prædicare* among the *Latins*; which does not ordinarily ſignifie Preaching, as ſome miſtake it, but performing the Office of a Κήρυξ, or *Præco* in the Aſſembly: Whence *Syneſius* [*o*] and ſome others call the Deacons ἱεροκήρυκας, The Holy Cryers of the Church, as thoſe that gave notice to

[*n*] Cyril. Catech. 17. n. 17. p. 224. Chryſoſt. Hom. 17. in Heb. 9.

[*o*] Syneſ. Ep. 67. Κήρυξ ὅταν ᾖπῃ, τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις.

the

the Congregation, how all things were regularly to be performed. Thus the word κηρύξαι frequently occurs in the ancient Rituals and Canons: As in the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, as ſoon as the Biſhop has ended his Sermon, the Deacon is to cry, Let the Hearers [p] and Unbelievers depart. Then he is to bid the Catechumens pray, and to call upon the Faithful alſo to pray for them, repeating a Form of Bidding Prayer, to inſtruct the People after what manner they were to pray for them. Which Form may be ſeen both in the Conſtitutions [q], and in [r] St. *Chryſoſtom*. After this the Deacon was to call in like manner upon the Energumens, the Competentes, and the Penitents in their ſeveral Orders, uſing the ſolemn Words of Exhortation both to them and the People to pray for them, ἐκτενῶς δεηθῶμεν, Let us ardently pray for them. Then again when the Deacon had diſmiſſed all theſe by a ſolemn Cry, ἀπολύεσθε, προέλθετε, or *Ite, Miſſa eſt*: He called upon the Faithful to pray again for themſelves, and the whole State of Chriſt's Church, repeating [s] another Form of Bidding Prayer before them. And this is there called the Deacon's προσφώνησις, or Exhortation to pray, to diſtinguiſh it from the Biſhops ἐπίκλησις, which was a direct Form of Addreſs to God, whereas the Deacons Addreſs was to the People: For which reaſon it was called προσφώνησις, and κηρύξαι, Bidding the People pray, or a Call and Exhortation to pray, with Directions what they ſhould pray for in particular. This the *Latins* called both *Oratio*, and *Prædicatio*, as may be ſeen in one of the Councils [t] of *Toledo*, which explains the word, *Orare*,

[p] Conſt. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 5. κηρυττέτω, μή τις τῶν ἀκροωμένων μή τις τῶν ἀπίστων. [q] Ibid. c. 6. [r] Chryſ. Hom. 2. in 2 Cor. [s] Conſt. Apoſt lib. 8. c. 10. [t] Con. Tolet. 4. c. 39. Unum Orarium oportet Levitam geſtare in ſiniſtro humero, propter quod orat, id eſt, prædicat.

by *Prædicare*, making them both to ſignifie this Office of the Deacon. And hence one of the Deacon's Ornaments (that I may note this by the way) is called by the ſame Council his *Orarium*, becauſe he uſed it ſometimes as a private Signal to give notice of the Prayers to his Brethren of the Clergy. By all this we may underſtand what *Socrates* means, when he ſays *Athanaſius* [*u*] commanded his Deacon κηρύξαι εὐχὴν to Bid Prayer; and how we are to interpret that controverted Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, which ſpeaking of ſome Deacons that had lapſed into Idolatry, and degrading them, ſays, They ſhould [*w*] no longer κηρύσσειν: Which ſome interpret Preaching, but others [*x*] more truly underſtand it of this part of the Deacon's Office, which was to be the κήρυξ or *Præco*, the Sacred Cryer of the Congregation.

Sect. 11. *7. Deacons allowed to Preach by the Biſhop's Authority.*

If it be enquired, Whether Deacons had any Power to preach publickly in the Congregation? The Anſwer muſt be the ſame, as in the Caſe of Baptiſm: They had Power to preach by Licenſe and Authority from the Biſhop, but not without it. The Author under the Name of [*y*] St. *Ambroſe* ſays poſitively, that Deacons did not preach in his time; though he thinks originally all Deacons were *Evangeliſts*, as *Philip* and *Stephen* were. I have ſhewed before, that Presbyters themſelves in many places were not allowed to preach in the Biſhop's Preſence, but by his ſpecial Leave, and therefore it is much more reaſonable to conclude the ſame of Deacons. *Blondel*

[*u*] Socrat. lib. 2. c. 11. [*w*] Con. Ancyr. c. 2.
[*x*] Habert. Pontifical. p. 203. Bevereg. Not. in Con. Ancyr. c. 2. Suicer. Theſaur. Eccleſ. T. 2. p. 99. [*y*] Ambroſ. Com. in Eph. 4. Nunc neq; Diaconi in Populo prædicant, neq; Clerici vel Laici baptizant.

[*z*] and

[z] and *Baronius* think that St. *Chryſoſtom* preached thoſe elegant Diſcourſes, *de Incomprehenſibili Dei Natura*, *de Anathemate*, &c. while he was but a Deacon. But others think [a] more probably, that thoſe were not Sermons which he preach'd in the Church, but only Diſcourſes that he compoſed upon other Occaſions; and that his firſt Sermon was that which he preached when he was ordained Presbyter, now extant in his 4 Vol. *p.* 953. But if he ever preached while he was Deacon, there is no queſtion to be made but that he had the Authority of his Biſhop *Meletius* for doing it: As *Philoſtorgius* [b] ſays, *Leontius* the *Arian* Biſhop of *Antioch* permitted *Aetius* his Deacon to preach publickly in the Church. *Ephrem Syrus* perhaps was another ſuch Inſtance: For he was never more than a Deacon of the Church of *Edeſſa*; yet *Photius* [c] ſays he compoſed ſeveral Homilies or Sermons, which were ſo excellent in their kind, that after his Death they were tranſlated into other Languages, and allowed to be read in many Churches immediately after the reading of the Scriptures, as St. *Jerom* [d] acquaints us. In ſome Places, as in the *French* Churches, the Deacons were authorized by Canon to read ſome ſuch Homilies in the Church inſtead of a Sermon, when the Presbyter happened to be Sick, and could not preach, as appears from the Order made in the Council of *Vaiſon* [e] upon this Occaſion. But here was Neceſſity and Permiſſion too: So that the Caſe of Deacons preaching in thoſe Ages of the Church ſeems

[z] Blondel. Apol. p. 57. Baron. an. 386. p. 532.

[a] Cave Hiſt. Liter. Vol. 1. p. 253. [b] Philoſtorg lib. 3. c. 17. διδασκειν ἐν ἐκκλησια ὁπτρεπει. [c] Phot. Cod. 196. λόγοι ἐυπέκ ϰ̀ παραφέκοντα. [d] Hieron. de Scriptor. c. 115.

[e] Con. Vaſenſ. 1. c. 2. Si Presbyter, aliqua infirmitate prohibente, per ſeipſum non potuerit prædicare, Sanctorum Patrum Homiliæ à Diaconibus recitentur.

to have been (according to the Reſolution, which *Vigilius* [*f*] afterward gave of it) Allowable, if authorized by the Biſhop; but a Preſumption both againſt Cuſtom and Canon, if done without his Permiſſion.

Sect. 12.

8. *Alſo to reconcile Penitents in caſes of extreme Neceſſity.*

And ſo the Caſe ſtood likewiſe with Deacons in reference to the Power of Reconciling Penitents, and granting them Abſolution. This was ordinarily the Biſhop's ſole Prerogative, as the ſupream Miniſter of the Church; and therefore rarely committed to Presbyters, but never to Deacons, except in Caſes of extreme Neceſſity, when neither Biſhop nor Presbyter were ready at hand to do it: In this Caſe Deacons were ſometimes authorized, as the Biſhop's ſpecial Delegates, to give Men the ſolemn Impoſition of Hands, which was the Sign of Reconciliation. Thus we find it in *Cyprian*, in the caſe of thoſe Penitents, whom the Martyrs by their Letters recommended to the favour of the Church: If, ſays he, they [*g*] are ſeized by any dangerous Diſtemper, they need not expect my Return, but may have Recourſe to any Presbyter that is preſent; or if a Presbyter cannot be found, they may make their Confeſſion before a Deacon; that ſo they may receive Impoſition of Hands, and go to the Lord in Peace. Here it is

[*f*] Vigil. Ep. ad Ruſtic. & Sebaſtian. Concil. Tom. 5. p. 554. Adjeciſtis etiam execranda ſuperbia, quæ nec leguntur, nec ſine ſui Pontificis juſſione aliquando Ordinis veſtri homines præſumpſerunt, auctoritatem vobis Prædicationis contra omnem Conſuetudinem vel Canones vindicare.

[*g*] Cypr. Ep. 13. al. 18. ad Cler. Si incommodo aliquo & infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non expectata præſentia noſtra, apud Presbyterum quemcunq; preſentem, vel ſi Presbyter repertus non fuerit, & urgere exitus cœperit, apud Diaconum quoque Exomologeſin facere delicti ſui poſſint; ut manu eis in pœnitentia impoſita veniant ad Dominum cum Pace.

ob-

obſervable, that none below a Deacon are commiſſioned to perform this Office; nor were the Deacons authorized to do it, but as the Biſhops Delegates, and that in Caſes of extreme Neceſſity, when no Presbyter could be found to reconcile the Penitent at the Point of Death.

And to ſuſpend the Inferior Clergy in ſome extraordinary Caſes.

In the like Caſe, that is, in the Caſe of abſolute Neceſſity, it ſeems very probable, that in ſome of the *Greek* Churches they had Power to ſuſpend the Inferior Clergy, when need ſo required, and neither Biſhop nor Presbyter was preſent to do it. Which may be collected from thoſe Words of the Author of the Conſtitutions [*i*], where he ſays, a Deacon Excommunicates a Subdeacon, a Reader, a Singer, a Deaconneſs, if there be occaſion, and the Presbyter be not at hand to do it. But a Subdeacon ſhall have no Power to Excommunicate any, either Clergy or Laity: For Subdeacons are only Miniſters of the Deacons. This was a Power then committed to Deacons in extraordinary Caſes, and a peculiar Privilege which none of the Inferior Clergy might enjoy.

Sect. 13.

9. *Deacons to attend upon their Biſhops, and ſometimes repreſent them in General Councils.*

It may be reckoned alſo among their extraordinary Offices, that they were ſometimes deputed by their Biſhops to be their Repreſentatives and Proxies in General Councils. Their ordinary Office there was only to attend upon their Biſhops, and perform the Duties of Scribes, and Diſputants, *&c.* according as they were directed by them; In which Station we commonly find them employed in the ancient Councils: But then there were two Things in which they were treated as in-

[*i*] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 28. Διάκονος ἀφορίζει ἢ καθιστᾷ διάκονον, &c.

ferior to Presbyters: 1. In that Presbyters are usually represented as sitting together with their Bishops, while the Deacons stood with all the People. 2. Presbyters were sometimes allowed to Vote, as has been shewed before; but there are no Instances that I know of, to evidence the same Privilege to belong to Deacons. Only when Bishops could not attend in Person, they many times sent their Deacons to represent them: And then they sat and Voted, not as Deacons, but as Proxies, in the Room and Place of those that sent them. Of which there are so many Instances in the Acts of the Councils, that it is needless to refer the Reader to any of them. Yet they that desire to see Examples, may consult *Christianus Lupus* in his Notes upon the *7th* Canon of the Council of *Trullo*, where he observes some difference in the Sitting and Voting of Deacons in the *Eastern* and *Western* Councils: In the *Eastern* Councils, if a Deacon represented a Metropolitan or a Patriarch, he sat and subscribed in the Place that the Metropolitan or Patriarch himself would have done, had he been present; but in the *Western* Councils it was otherwise: There the Deacons Voted after all the Bishops, and not in the Place of those whose Proxies they were.

Thus it was in General Councils. But in Provincial and Consistorial Synods the Deacons were sometimes allowed to give their Voice, as well as the Presbyters in their own Name. Of which the Reader may see several Instances in the *Roman* Councils under *Symmachus* and *Gregory* II. published by *Justellus* [k] in his *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, and in the *4th* Tome of the Councils, where first the Bishops, then the Presbyters, and then the Deacons, subscribe every one in their own Name in particular. And those that are Curious about this Matter, may

[k] *See before* Chap. 19. Sect. 12.

fur-

furniſh themſelves with many other ſuch Examples.

Sect. 14.

10. *Deacons empowered to rebuke and correct Men that behaved themſelves irregularly in the Church.*

There are two Things more to be obſerved concerning the Office of Deacons in Church-Aſſemblies. 1. That as they were the Regulators and Directors of Men's Behaviour in Divine Service; ſo they had Power to rebuke the Irregular, and chaſtiſe them for any indecent and unſeemly Deportment. The Conſtitutions often mention ſuch Acts as theſe belonging to the Deacon's Office. If any one be found ſitting out of his Place, let the Deacon rebuke him [*l*], and transfer him to his proper Station, as the Pilot or Steerſ-man of the Church. And again a little after, Let the Deacon [*m*] overlook and ſuperintend the People, that no one Talk, or Sleep, or Laugh, but give ear to the Word of God. This is evident alſo from St. *Chryſoſtom*, who ſpeaking of the irreverent Behaviour of ſome in the Church, bids their Neighbours firſt rebuke them, and if they would not bear it, to call the Deacon [*] to do his Office toward them. Agreeable to this *Optatus* tells us a very remarkable Story of *Cæcilian* Archdeacon of *Carthage*, that obſerving one *Lucilla* a rich Woman commit an indecent Act in the time of Receiving the Holy Communion; (for before ſhe received the Bread and Wine, ſhe was uſed to kiſs the Relicks of ſome pretended Martyr); He rebuked her [*n*] for it by vertue of his Office: Which ſhe ſo highly reſented, that afterward when he was choſen Biſhop, ſhe factiouſly withdrew her ſelf with ſome others from

[*l*] Conſt. Ap. l. 2. c. 57. ἐπιπλησσέσθω αὐτὸν διάκονος, ὡς πρῴρεως, &c. [*m*] Ibid. p. 264. Ὁ διάκονος ἐπισκοπείτω τὸν λαὸν, &c. Confer. lib. 8. c. 11. [*] Chryſ. Hom. 24. in Act. [*n*] Optat. lib. 1. p. 40. Cum correptionem Archidiaconi Cæciliani ferre non poſſet, quæ ante ſpiritalem cibum & potum, os neſcio cujus Martyris, ſi tamen Martyris, libare dicebatur, &c.

his

his Communion; and pretending his Ordination to be illegal, she by her Power got *Majorinus* ordained against him: And this was one of the Principal Causes of the Schism of the *Donatists*, as *Optatus* there observes: It had its Rise from the Implacable Malice of a Proud and Angry Woman, who could never forgive the Deacon that rebuked her in the Church. Some may perhaps imagine, that what *Cæcilian* did was by virtue of a Superior Office, and that as Archdeacon he was of an higher Order, as now commonly Archdeacons are. But I shall shew in the next Chapter, that anciently Archdeacons were always of the Order of Deacons, and of no other Degree: And it appears from what has here been already discoursed, that this Act of *Cæcilian* was not from any peculiar Power, that he enjoyed as Archdeacon, but from that ordinary Power to rebuke Offenders, which he had in common with all the other Deacons of the Church.

Sect. 15.

11. *Deacons anciently performed the Offices of all the Inferior Orders of the Church.*

The other thing I would farther Remark concerning the Office of Deacons, is this, That before the Institution of the Inferior Orders of the Church (which were not set up in all Churches at once, nor perhaps in any Church for the two first Ages, as shall be shewed hereafter) the Deacons were employed to perform all such Offices, as were in after-Ages committed to those Orders; such as the Offices of Readers, Subdeacons, Exorcists or Catechists, Door-keepers, and the like. Thus *Epiphanius* [o] observes, that originally all Offices of the Church were performed by Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, and therefore no Church was without a Deacon. This was certainly the Practice in the time of *Ignatius*, who never speaks of any Order below

[o] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Arrian.

that

that of Deacons: But without them, he ſays, no Church was [p] called a Church. So that all the Inferior Offices muſt then be performed by Deacons. And even in after-Ages we find that ſeveral of the Inferior Offices were many times put upon the ſame Man, perhaps to avoid the charge of maintaining an over-numerous Clergy in leſſer Churches. Thus *Euſebius* tells us, that *Romanus* the Martyr [q] was both Deacon and Exorciſt in the Church of *Cæſarea*. And *Procopius* the Martyr had three Offices in the Church of *Scythopolis*. He was at once Reader, Interpreter, and Exorciſt; as we learn from the Acts of his Martyrdom [r] publiſhed by *Valeſius*. Now both theſe were Martyred in the beginning of the 4*th* Century, in the time of the *Diocletian* Perſecution. And we find a whole Age after this, if the Author under the Name of St. *Auſtin* [s] may be credited, that except in ſuch great and rich Churches as the Church of *Rome*, where there was a numerous Clergy, all the Inferior Services were ſtill performed by the Deacons. In the *Greek* Church they were always the πυλωροὶ, or Door-keepers, in the time of the Oblation and Celebration of the *Euchariſt*, as may be ſeen in the Apoſtolical [t] Conſtitutions, where the Deacons are commanded to ſtand at the Men's Gate, and the Subdeacons at the Women's, to ſee that no one ſhould go out or come in, during the time of the Oblation. Theſe were anciently the Deacons principal Employments in the Aſſemblies of the Church.

[p] Ignat. Ep. ad Tral. n. 3. [q] Euſeb. de Martyr. Palæſtin. c. 2. [r] Acta Procop. ap. Valeſ. Not. in Euſeb. de Martyr. Pæleſt. c. 1. Ibi Eccleſiæ tria Miniſteria præbebat: Unum in Legendi Officio, alterum in Syri Interpretatione Sermonis, & tertium adverſus Dæmones manus Impoſitione conſummans. [s] Aug. Quæſt. Vet. & Nov. Teſt. c. 101, *cited before*, §. 4. [t] Conſt. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 11.

But

Sect. 16.

12. *Deacons the Biſhop's Sub-Almoners.*

But beſides theſe we are to take notice of two or three other Offices, in which they were commonly employed by the Biſhop out of the Church. One of theſe was to be his Sub-Almoners, to take care of the Neceſſitous, ſuch as Orphans, Widows, Virgins, Martyrs in Priſon, and all the Poor and Sick who had any Title to be maintained out of the Publick Revenues of the Church. The Deacons were particularly to enquire into the Neceſſities and Wants of all theſe, and make Relation thereof to the Biſhop, and then diſtribute to them ſuch Charities as they received from him towards their Relief and Aſſiſtance. The Archdeacon indeed was as it were the Biſhops Treaſurer, but all the Deacons were his Diſpenſers, or Miniſters of the Churches Charity to the Indigent. Which appears from ſeveral Paſſages in [*u*] *Cyprian*, *Dionyſius* [*w*] of *Alexandria*, and the Author [*x*] of the Conſtitutions, who ſpeak indifferently of this Office, as common to all the Deacons. Particularly in the Conſtitutions the Duty of the Deacon is thus deſcribed, That he ſhould inform his Biſhop, when he knows any one to be in Diſtreſs, and then diſtribute to their Neceſſities by the Directions of the Biſhop; but to do nothing clancularly without his Conſent, leſt that might ſeem to accuſe him of neglecting the Diſtreſſed, and ſo turn to his Reproach, and raiſe a Murmuring againſt him.

Sect. 17.

13. *Deacons to inform the Biſhop of the Miſdemeanours of the People.*

Another Office of the Deacons in this Reſpect was to make Enquiry into the Morals and Converſation of the People; and ſuch Evils as he could not redreſs himſelf, by the ordinary Power which was

[*u*] Cypr. Ep. 49. al. 52. ad Cornel. [*w*] Dionyſ. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 7. cap. 11. [*x*] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 31, & 32. Lib. 3. c. 19.

entruſt-

entruſted in his Hands, of thoſe he was to give Information to the Biſhop, that he by his Supreme Authority might redreſs them. Let the Deacon, ſays the Book [y] of Conſtitutions, refer all things to the Biſhop, as Chriſt did to the Father: Such things as he is able, let him rectify, by the Power which he has from the Biſhop; but the weightier Cauſes let the Biſhop judge.

Sect. 18. *Hence Deacons commonly called the Biſhops Eyes, his Mouth, Angels, Prophets,* &c.

Upon this account the Deacons were uſually ſtiled the Biſhop's Eyes and his Ears, his Mouth, his Right-hand, and his Heart; becauſe by their Miniſtery he overlooked his Charge, and by them took Cognizance of Men's Actions, as much as if he himſelf had ſeen them with his own Eyes, or heard them with his own Ears: By them he ſent Directions and Orders to his Flock, in which reſpect they were his Mouth and his Heart; by them he diſtributed to the Neceſſities of the Indigent, and ſo they were his Right-hand. Theſe Titles are frequently to be met with in the Conſtitutions [z] and the Author of the Epiſtle [a] to St. *James*. And *Iſidore* of *Peluſium* in Alluſion to them, writing to *Lucius* [b] an Archdeacon, he tells him in the Phraſe of the Church, that he ought to be all Eye, foraſmuch as Deacons were the Eyes of the Biſhop. The Author of the Conſtitutions [c] terms them likewiſe the Biſhops Angels and Prophets, becauſe they were the Perſons whom he chiefly employed in Meſſages, either to his own People, or foreign Churches. For then Biſhops did nothing but by the Mouth or Hands of one of their Clergy.

[y] Conſt. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 44. [z] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 44. Lib. 3. c. 19. [a] Clem. Ep. ad Jacob. c. 12. [b] Iſidor. Lib. 1. Ep. 29. [c] Conſt. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 30.

For

Sect. 19.
Deacons to be multiplied according to the Neceſſities of the Church.

For this Reaſon, there being ſuch a Multitude and Variety of Buſineſs commonly attending the Deacon's Office, it was uſual to have ſeveral Deacons in the ſame Church. In ſome Churches they were very preciſe to the Number Seven, in imitation of the firſt Church of *Jeruſalem*. The Council of *Neocæſarea* [d] enacted it into a Canon, That there ought to be but Seven Deacons in any City, though it was never ſo great, becauſe this was according to the Rule ſuggeſted in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*. And the Church of *Rome*, both before and after this Council, ſeems to have looked upon that as a binding Rule alſo. For it is evident from the Epiſtle of *Cornelius*, [e] written in the Middle of the Third Century, that there were then but Seven Deacons in the Church of *Rome*, though there were Forty ſix Presbyters at the ſame time. And *Prudentius* intimates that it was ſo in the time of *Sixtus* alſo, *An.* 261. For ſpeaking of *Laurentius* the Deacon, he terms him [f] the Chief of thoſe ſeven Men, who had their Station near the Altar, meaning the Seven Deacons of the Church. Nay, in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries the Cuſtom there continued the ſame, as we learn both from *Sozomen* [g], and *Hilarius Sardus* [h] the *Roman* Deacon who wrote under the Name of St. *Ambroſe*. But *Sozomen* ſays, this Rule was not obſerved in other Churches, but the Number of Deacons was indifferent, as the Buſineſs

[d] Conc. Neocæſar. c. 15. [e] Cornel. Ep. ad Fabi. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 6. c. 43. [f] Prudent. Hymn. de S. Laurent. Hic primus è Septem viris qui ſtant ad aram proximi. [g] Sozom. Lib. 7. c. 19. Διάκονοι ἑπτὰ Ῥωμαίοις εἰσὶ νῦν· ὁ πλείους εἰσὶν ἐπιλά. [h] Ambroſ. Com. in 1 Tim. 3 p. 995. Nunc autem ſeptem Diaconos eſſe oportet, aliquantos Presbyteros, ut bini ſint per Eccleſias, & unus in Civitate Epiſcopus.

of

of every Church required. And it is certain it was ſo at *Alexandria*, and *Conſtantinople*. For though one of the Writers of the Life of St. *Mark*, cited [*i*] by Bp. *Pearſon*, ſays St. *Mark* ordained but ſeven Deacons at *Alexandria*, yet in after-Ages there were more: For *Alexander* in one of his Circular Letters [*k*] names Nine Deacons, whom he depoſed with *Arius* for their Heretical Opinions; and it is probable there were ſeveral others, who continued Orthodox: For in the Form of *Arius* his Condemnation, publiſhed [*l*] by *Cotelerius*, the Catholick Deacons of *Alexandria* and *Mareotes* are mentioned, as joining with their Biſhop in condemning him. And for the Church of *Conſtantinople*, the Number of Deacons was there ſo great, that in one of *Juſtinian*'s Novels [*m*] we find them limited to an Hundred for the Service of the Great Church, and three others only. So that it is evident the Number of Deacons uſually increaſed with the Neceſſities of the Church, and the Church of *Rome* was ſingular in the contrary Practice.

Sect. 20.
Of the Age at which Deacons might be ordained.

I ſpeak nothing here of the Qualifications required in Deacons, becauſe they were generally the ſame that were required in Biſhops and Presbyters, and will be ſpoken of hereafter: Only in their Age there was ſome Difference, which is here to be obſerved. Biſhops and Presbyters, as has been noted above, might not ordinarily be ordained before Thirty, but Deacons were allowed to be ordained at Twenty five, and not before. This is the Term fixed both

[*i*] Vit. S. Marci ap. Pearſon. Vind. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 11. p. 329. B. Marcus Anizanum Alexandriæ ordinavit Epiſcopum, & tres Presbyteros, & ſeptem Diaconos. [*k*] Alex. Ep. Encycl. ap. Theodor. Lib. 1. c. 4. [*l*] Coteler. Not. in Conſt. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 28. [*m*] Juſtin. Novel. 3 c. 1

by

by the Civil and Canon Law, as may be ſeen in *Juſtinian's* [n] Novels, the Council [o] of *Agde*, *Carthage*, *Trullo*, and many others. And it was a Rule very nicely obſerved: For though we meet with ſome Biſhops that were ordained before this Age; yet thoſe (as I have ſhewed before) were never Deacons, but ordained immediately Biſhops from Laymen: But among thoſe that were ordained Deacons, we ſcarce meet with an Inſtance of any one that was ordained before the Age of Twenty five in all the Hiſtory of the Church.

Sect. 21. *Of the Reſpect which Deacons paid to Presbyters, and received from the Inferior Orders.*

The laſt thing which I ſhall obſerve of Deacons, is the great Deference and Reſpect they were obliged to pay to Presbyters, as well as to the Biſhop. It has been proved before, that the Presbyters had their Thrones in the Church, whereon they ſat together with their Biſhop: But the Deacons had no ſuch Privilege, but are always repreſented as ſtanding by them. So the Author [p] of the Conſtitutions, and *Gregory* [q] *Nazianzen* place them in this Order, *viz.* The Biſhop ſitting on the middle Throne, the Presbyters ſitting on each Hand of him, and the Deacons ſtanding by. The Council of *Nice* expreſly [r] forbids Deacons to ſit among the Presbyters in the Church. And it is evident from St. *Jerom* [s], and the Author under the

[n] Juſt. Novel. 123. c. 14. Presbyterum minorem triginta quinque annorum fieri non permittimus. Sed neque Diaconum aut ſubdiaconum Viginti quinque. [o] Conc. Agathenſ. c. 16. Conc. Carthag. 3. c. 4. Conc. Trull. c. 14. Conc. Tolet. 4. c. 19. [p] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 57. [q] Greg. Naz: Somn. de Eccl. Anaſtaſ. [r] Conc. Nic. c. 18. [s] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad. Evagr. In Eccleſia Romæ Presbyteri ſedent, & ſtant Diaconi.

Name

Name of [t] St. *Auſtin*, that though the *Roman* Deacons were grown the moſt elated of any others, yet they did not preſume to ſit in the Church. Nay, ſome Canons go farther, and forbid [u] Deacons to ſit any where in the Preſence of a Presbyter, except by his Permiſſion.

The like Reſpect they were to pay to Presbyters in ſeveral other Inſtances, being obliged to miniſter to them, as well as to the Biſhop, in the Performance of all Divine Offices; none of which might be performed by a Deacon in the Preſence of a Presbyter, without ſome ſpecial Reaſon for it, as has been noted before. Nay, a Deacon was not allowed ſo much as to bleſs a common Feaſt, if a Presbyter was preſent at it: As we may ſee in St. *Jerom*'s [x] Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, where he cenſures the *Roman* Deacons ſomewhat ſharply for preſuming ſo to do.

But then as the Canons obliged Deacons to pay this Reſpect to Presbyters; ſo to diſtinguiſh them from the Leſſer Clergy, all the Inferior Orders were required to pay the ſame Reſpect to them. The Council of *Laodicea* in the ſame Canon that ſays, a Deacon ſhall not ſit in the Preſence of a Presbyter without his Leave, adds immediately after, That in like manner the Deacon ſhall be honoured by the Subdeacons, and all the other Clergy. And the Council of *Agde* [y] repeats the Canon in the ſame

[t] Aug. Quæſt Vet. & Nov. Teſt. c. 101. Quanquam Romanæ Eccleſiæ Diaconi modice inverecundiores videantur, ſedendi tamen dignitatem in Eccleſia non præſumunt [u] Concil. Laodic. c. 22. Carthag. 4. c. 39. [x] Hieron. Ep. 85 ad Evagr. Licet increbreſcentibus vitiis, inter Presbyteros abſente Epiſcopo ſedere Diaconum viderim: Et in domeſticis Conviviis, Benedictiones Presbyteris dare, al. Benedictiones coram Presbyteris dare. [y] Conc. Agathenſ. c. 65. Non oportet Diaconum ſedere præſente Presbytero, ſed ex juſſione Presbyteri ſedeat. Similiter autem honorificetur Diaconus à Miniſtris inferioribus & omnibus Clericis.

Words. I ſhall here alſo remind the Reader of what I have obſerved before, That Deacons in ſome Churches had Power to cenſure the Inferior Clergy in the abſence of the Presbyters. St. *Jerom* [z] ſeems alſo to ſay, that their Revenues were rather greater than thoſe of the Presbyters, which made them ſometimes troubleſome and aſſuming. Beſide all this the Order of Deacons was of great Repute, becauſe the Archdeacon was always then one of this Order, and He was commonly a Man of great Intereſt and Authority in the Church; of whoſe Powers and Privileges, becauſe it is neceſſary to diſcourſe a little more particularly, I ſhall treat diſtinctly of them in the following Chapter.

CHAP. XXI.

Of Archdeacons.

Sect. 1. *Archdeacons anciently of the ſame Order with Deacons.*

THough Archdeacons in theſe laſt Ages of the Church have uſually been of the Order of Presbyters, yet anciently they were no more than Deacons: which appears evidently from thoſe Writers, who give us the firſt Account of them. St. *Jerom* [a] ſays the Archdeacon was choſen out of the Deacons, and was the Principal Deacon in every Church, as the Archpresbyter was the Principal Presbyter; and that there was but

[z] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Presbyter noverit ſe Lucris minorem, Sacerdotio eſſe majorem. Id. Com. in Ezek. c. 48 Ultra Sacerdotes, hoc eſt, Presbyteros intumeſcunt: & Dignitatem non merito ſed Divitiis æſtimant. [a] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Aut Diaconi eligant de ſe, quem induſtrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocent. Id. Ep. 4. ad Ruſtic. Singuli Eccleſiarum Epiſcopi, ſinguli Archipresbyteri, ſinguli Archidiaconi.

one

one of each in every Church. *Optatus* calls *Cæcilian* [b] Archdeacon of *Carthage*, yet he was never more than a Deacon, till he was ordained Biſhop, as has been ſhewed before: And that made *Cæcilian* himſelf ſay, That if he was not rightly ordained Biſhop, as the *Donatiſts* pretended, he [c] was to be treated only as a Deacon. It is certain alſo St. *Lawrence*, Archdeacon of *Rome*, was no more than the Chief of the Deacons, or the Principal [d] Man of the Seven, who ſtood and waited at the Altar, as *Prudentius* words it. From theſe Teſtimonies it is very plain, that in thoſe Times the Archdeacon was always one of the Order of Deacons.

Sect. 2. *Elected by the Biſhop and not made by Seniority.*

But how the Archdeacon came by his Honour, and after what Manner he was inveſted with his Office, is a Matter of ſome Diſpute among Learned Men. *Salmaſius* [e] and ſome others are of Opinion, that originally He was no more than the Senior Deacon, though they own that in proceſs of Time the Office became Elective. *Habertus* [f] thinks it was always Elective, and that it was at the Biſhops Liberty and Diſcretion to nominate which of the Deacons he thought fit to the Office. That it was ſo in the Caſe of *Athanaſius*, ſeems pretty evident from what *Theodoret* [g] ſays of him, That though he was very young, yet he was made Chief of the Order of Deacons. For this implies, as *Valeſius* there

[b] Optat. Lib. 1. p. 40. Cum correptionem Archidiaconi Cæciliani ferre non poſſet, &c. [c] Optat. Ibid. p. 41. Iterum à Cæciliano mandatum eſt, ut ſi Felix in ſe, ſicut illi arbitrabantur, nihil contuliſſet, ipſi tanquam adhuc Diaconum ordinarent Cæcilianum. [d] Prudent. Hymn. de S. Steph. Hic Primus è ſeptem viris, qui ſtant ad aram proximi. [e] Salmaſ. de Primat. p. 8. Suicer. Theſaur. Eccl. T. 1. p. 531. [f] Habert. Pontifical. Obſ. 6. p. 206. [g] Theod. Lib. 1. c. 26. Νεος ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἡλικίας, τὴν τοῦ διακονου ἠγέσατο.

obſerves, that he was choſen by the Biſhop, and preferred before his Seniors. St. *Jerom* in the fore-cited Paſſage as plainly aſſerts that the Office went not by Seniority, but Election: Only he ſeems to put the Power of Electing in the Deacons: But if they had any Hand in it, it muſt be underſtood to be under the Direction of the Biſhop, who is required by ſome Canons to chuſe his own Archdeacon, and ordinarily to give Preference to the Senior, if he was duly qualified: But if not, to make choice of any other, whom he thought moſt fit to diſcharge the Offices of the Church [*b*] and the Truſt that was repoſed in him.

Sect. 3. *Commonly Perſons of ſuch Intereſt in the Church, that they were choſen the Biſhops Succeſſors.*

The Office of the Archdeacon was always a Place of great Honour and Reputation: For he was the Biſhop's conſtant Attendant and Aſſiſtant; and next to the Biſhop the Eyes of the whole Church were fixed upon him. By which means he commonly gained ſuch an Intereſt, as to get himſelf choſen the Biſhop's Succeſſor before the Presbyters. Of which it were eaſy to give ſeveral Inſtances, as *Athanaſius*, *Cæcilian*, and many others. And this, I preſume, was the Reaſon why St. *Jerom* ſays, That an Archdeacon thought himſelf [*i*] injured, if he was ordained a Presbyter: Probably becauſe he thereby loſt his Intereſt in the Church, and was diſappointed of his Preferment. We might certainly conclude it was thus in the

[*b*] Conc. Agathenſ. c. 23. Si Officium Archidiaconatus, propter ſimpliciorem Naturam implere aut expedire nequiverit, ille loci ſui nomen teneat, & ordinationi Eccleſiæ, quem Epiſcopus elegerit, præponatur. [*i*] Hieron. Com. in Ezek. c. 48. Certe qui primus fuerit Miniſtrorum, quia per ſingula concionatur in Populos, & à Pontificis Latere non recedit, injuriam putat, ſi Presbyter ordinetur.

Church

Church of *Rome*, if what *Eulogius* a *Greek* Writer in *Photius* ſays, might be depended on as true: That it was a Law [*k*] at *Rome* to chuſe the Archdeacon the Biſhop's Succeſſor, and that therefore *Cornelius* ordained *Novatian* Presbyter, to deprive him of the Privilege and Hopes of ſucceeding. But I confeſs there is no ſmall Reaſon to queſtion the Truth of this Relation, both becauſe we read of no ſuch Law in any Writer of the *Latin* Church; and becauſe this Author palpably miſtakes, in ſaying, that *Cornelius* ordained *Novatian* Presbyter, who was Presbyter long before; and probably never was Archdeacon, nor Deacon, but ordained Presbyter immediately from a Layman, as may be collected from the Letters of *Cyprian* [*l*] and *Cornelius* [*m*], which tacitly reflect upon him for it. Yet if by Law *Eulogius* meant no more than Cuſtom; perhaps it might be cuſtomary at *Rome*, as at ſome other Places, to make the Archdeacons the Biſhops Succeſſors: Their Power and Privileges, as I obſerved, commonly gaining them a conſiderable Intereſt both among the Clergy and the People.

Sect. 4. *The Offices of the Archdeacon. 1ſt, To attend the Biſhop at the Altar*, &c.

As to the Archdeacon's Office, He was always the Biſhop's immediate Miniſter and Attendant: *A latere Pontificis non receſſit*, to uſe St *Jerom*'s Phraſe, He was always by his Side, ready to aſſiſt him. Particularly at the Altar, when the Biſhop miniſtred, he performed the uſual Offices of a Deacon, that have been mentioned in the laſt Chapter. The Author of the Conſtitutions calls him the Ὁ παρεστὼς τῷ Ἀρχιερεῖ, the Deacon that ſtood by the Biſhop,

[*k*] Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 182. Τὸν ἀρχιδιάκονον ἐνενόμιζο διάδοχον τῦ ἀρχιερατεύον[τ]ος καθίστασθαι.

[*l*] Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 103. [*m*] Cornel. Ep. ad Fabian. ap. Euſeb. Lib. 6. c. 43.

and proclaimed, when the Communion-Service began, *Let no* [n] *one approach in Wrath againſt his Brother, Let no one come in Hypocriſy.* To him it belonged to miniſter the Cup to the People, when the Biſhop celebrated the Euchariſt, and had adminiſtred the Bread before him, as we learn from the Account which St. *Ambroſe* [o] gives of *Laurentius* Archdeacon of *Rome.* It was his Buſineſs alſo, as the Biſhop's Subſtitute, to order all Things relating to the Inferior Clergy, and their Miniſtrations and Services in the Church: As what Deacon ſhould read the Goſpel, who ſhould bid the Prayers, which of them ſhould keep the Doors, which walk about the Church to obſerve the Behaviour of the People; which of the Readers, Acolythiſts, Subdeacons, ſhould perform their Service at ſuch a Time, or in what Poſt and Station: For theſe Things were not preciſely determined, but at the Biſhop's Liberty to ordain and appoint them; which he commonly did by his Archdeacon: Whoſe Orders and Directions therefore are ſometimes called *Ordinationes*, and *Ordinatio* [p] *Eccleſiæ*, in ſome of the ancient Councils. Whence I preſume came the Name, *Ordinary*, which is a Title given to Archdeacons in after-Ages.

Sect. 5.
2. *To aſſiſt him in managing the Churches Revenues.*

2. He aſſiſted the Biſhop in managing and diſpenſing the Churches Revenues, having the chief Care of the Poor, Orphans, Widows, *&c.* under the Biſhop, whoſe Portions were aſſigned by him, and ſent by the Hands of the other Deacons that were under him. The Fourth Council [q] of *Carthage* makes

[n] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 57. [o] Ambroſ. de Offic. Lib. 1. c. 41. [p] Vid. Concil. Agathenſ. c. 23. Iſidor. Hiſpal. Ep. ad Ludifred. ap. Gratian. Diſt. 25. c. 1. [q] Conc. Carth. 4. c. 17. Ut Epiſcopus gubernationem Viduarum, Pupillorum ac Peregrinorum, non per ſeipſum, ſed per Archipreſbyterum, aut per Archidiaconum agat.

men-

mention of this part of his Office, when it requires the Biſhop not to concern himſelf Perſonally in the Care and Government of the Widows, Orphans, Strangers, but to commit this to his Archpresbyter or Archdeacon. Upon this Account *Prudentius* deſcribing [r] the Offices of St. *Lawrence*, whom he makes to be Archdeacon of *Rome*, among other Things aſſigns him the Keys of the Churches Treaſure, and the Care of diſpenſing the Oblations of the People. And for the ſame Reaſon both he and St. *Ambroſe*, [s] and all other Writers of his Paſſion, bring in the Heathen Perſecutor demanding of him thoſe Treaſures, which he had in his keeping: Which he promiſing to do, in a ſhort time after brought before him the Poor, the Lame, the Blind, the Infirm, telling him, thoſe were the Riches which he had in his Cuſtody; for on them he had expended the Churches Treaſure. St. *Auſtin* ſays this was his Office, as he was Archdeacon of the Church. *Paulinus* [t] therefore calls the Archdeacon, *Arcæ Cuſtodem*, The Keeper of the Cheſt: Becauſe though the other Deacons were the Diſpenſers and Conveyers, yet he was the chief Manager and Director of them, and from him they took their Orders, as from the Guardian of the Churches Treaſure. It was upon this Account that the *Donatiſts* charged *Cæcilian* among other things, that he had prohibited the Deacons from carrying any Proviſion [u] to the Mar-

[r] Prudent. Hymn. de Stº. Laur. Levita ſublimis gradu, & cæteris præſtantior, Clauſtris ſacrorum præerat, Cœleſtis arcanum Domus fidis gubernans clavibus, votaſque diſpenſans Opes.

[s] Ambroſ. de Offic. L. 2. c. 28. Aug Serm. 111. de Diverſis. Sanctus Laurentius Archidiaconus fuit: Opes Eccleſiæ ab illo Perſecutore quærebantur. Id. de Diverſ Ser. 123. [t] Paulin. de Mirac. S. Martin. Lib. 4. Bibl Patr. T 8. p. 865.

Protinus adſtanti Diacono, quem more priorum
Antiſtes Sanctæ Cuſtodem legerat Arcæ,
Imperat. &c.

[u] Aug. Brevic. Collat. 3. c. 14.

tyrs in Priſon. Which Objection muſt be grounded upon this, that he was obliged by his Office, as he was Archdeacon, to ſee that the Martyrs were provided of Suſtenance; which they pretended he had not only neglected, but abuſed his Authority, in forbidding thoſe that were under his Command, to Miniſter unto them.

Sect. 6.
3. *In Preaching.*

3. Another part of his Office was to aſſiſt the Biſhop in Preaching. For as any Deacon was authorized to preach by the Biſhops Leave, ſo the Archdeacon being the moſt eminent of the Deacons, was more frequently pitched upon to diſcharge this Office, if we may ſo underſtand thoſe words of St. *Jerom*, which have been cited before in the 3*d* Section, *Primus Miniſtrorum per ſingula concionatur in populos.* The chief Miniſter, or Archdeacon, is many Times, and in many Places employed in Preaching to the People. For the word, *Singula*, may relate both to Times and Places. But if any one thinks, that *Concionari* here ſignifies no more than *Prædicare* and κηρύσσειν, doing the Office of an Holy Cryer in the Aſſembly, I ſhall not contend about it; but only ſay, that St. *Jerom* ſpeaking of ſomething that then made the Archdeacons Popular, ſeems rather to mean the Office of Preaching, than any other.

Sect. 7.
4. *In ordaining the Inferior Clergy.*

4. The Archdeacon uſually bore a Part with the Biſhop in the Ordinations of the Inferior Clergy, Subdeacons, Acolythiſts, *&c.* His Office in this matter is particularly deſcribed in ſeveral Canons [*w*] of the 4*th* Council of *Carthage*, which relate the manner how the Inferior Clergy were to be ordained; *viz.* not by Impoſition of

[*w*] Concil. Carth. 4. c. 5, 6, 9.

Hands,

Hands, which belonged only to the Superior Orders, but by receiving ſome Veſſels or Utenſils of the Church, partly from the Hands of the Biſhop, and partly from the Hands of the Archdeacon. As to give only one Inſtance in the Ordination of an Acolythiſt, the Canon ſays, The Biſhop was to inform him what his Duty was, and then the Archdeacon was to give him a Taper into his Hand, that he might know that he was appointed to light the Candles of the Church.

Sect. 8.

5. The Archdeacon had Power to cenſure Deacons and the Inferior Clergy, but not Presbyters.

5. The Archdeacon was inveſted alſo with a Power of Cenſuring the other Deacons, and all the Inferior Clergy of the Church. That it was ſo, at leaſt in ſome Churches, is very evident from a Paſſage in the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon*, where *Ibas* Biſhop of *Edeſſa* ſpeaking of *Maras* one of the Deacons of his Church, ſays, he was not Excommunicated by himſelf, but by his Archdeacon, who [x] for a Crime committed againſt a Presbyter, ſuſpended him from the Communion.

But whether the Archdeacon had any Power over Presbyters, is a matter of Diſpute among Learned Men. *Salmaſius* [y], and the Learned *Suicerus* [z] after him, ſcruple not to aſſert, that even the Archpreſbyter himſelf in the *Roman* Church was ſubject to him. *Cujacius* and ſome others, who are cited by [a] *Baluzius*, go one ſtep farther, and ſay it was ſo in all Churches. Yet there is not the leaſt Footſtep of any ſuch Power to be met with in any ancient Writer or Council: But the Original of all the Miſtake is

[x] Con. Chalced. Act. 10. p. 653. Ἀκοινώνητός ἐστι τοῦ ἰδίου Ἀρχιδιακόνου, &c. [y] Salmaſ. de Primat. c. 1. p. 9. [z] Suicer. Theſaur. T. 1. p. 533. [a] Baluz. Not. ad Gratian. Diſt 25. c. 1. p. 455.

owing

owing to a Corruption in *Gratian*'s Decree, and *Gregory* the Ninth's Decretals, who cite the Words alledged [*b*] in the Margin, the one as from *Iſidore* of *Sevil*, and the other from the Council of *Toledo*, pretending that the Archpresbyter is to be ſubject to the Archdeacon: When yet, as both *Baluzius* and the *Roman* Correctors confeſs, there are no ſuch Words to be found in *Iſidore*'s Epiſtle; nor will *Garſias Loaiſa* own them to be the Genuine Decree of any Council of *Toledo*. So that the whole credit of this Matter reſts upon *Gratian* and the Compilers of the Decretals, whoſe Authority is of little Eſteem in things relating to Antiquity, when there is no better Proof than their bare Aſſertion. Yet I ſhall not deny, but that in *Gratian*'s Time it might be as he repreſents it: For probably by this time the Archdeacons were choſen out of the Order of Preſbyters: Though when firſt they began to be ſo, is not very eaſie to determine. Only we are certain that ſome Centuries before the time of *Gratian* the Cuſtom was altered. For Archdeacons in the *9th* Century, were ſome of them at leaſt of the Order of Presbyters; as appears from *Hincmar*'s *Capitula* [*c*] directed to *Guntharius* and *Odelhardus*, two of his Archdeacons, whom he ſtiles, Presbyter-Archdeacons. And there is reaſon enough to think it was ſo in the time of *Gratian*; The Archdeacons were then generally of the Order of Presbyters, as they have been ever ſince: Which makes it no wonder that in *Gratian*'s time they ſhould have Power over the *Archipresbyteri*, which in the Language of that

[*b*] Grat. Diſt. 25. c. 1. ex Epiſt. Iſidor. Hiſpal. ad Ludifred' Archipresbyter vero ſe eſſe ſub Archidiacono, ejuſq, præceptis ſicut Epiſcopi ſui, Sciat obedire. *In* Gregory's *Decretal;* Lib. 1. Tit. 24. de Officio Archipresb. c. 1. *the ſame words are cited* ex Concilio Toletano. [*c*] Hincmar. Capitula Archidiaconibus Presbyteris data. Concil. Tom. 8. p. 591.

Age

Age often ſignifies no more than Rural Deans, over which the Archdeacons have uſually Power at this Day. But by this the Reader may judge how little ſuch Writers are to be depended on, who take their Eſtimate of former Ages from the Practice of their own, and reckon every thing ancient, that is agreeable to the Rules and Cuſtoms of the Times they live in.

Sect. 9. *Of the Name ἀναγνώστης, Circumluſtrator and whether Archdeacons had any Power over the whole Dioceſe.*

But to return to the Archdeacons of the Primitive Church: There is one thing more may admit of ſome Diſpute, Whether the Archdeacons Power anciently extended over the whole Dioceſe, or was confined to the City or Mother-Church. In the middle Ages of the Church, there is no queſtion but they had Power over the whole Dioceſe. For *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*, who lived in the beginning of the *7th* Century, in the Account which he gives of the Archdeacons Office, ſays, The Parochial Clergy were under his Care, that is, the Deacons and Inferior Clergy; and that it belonged to him [*d*] to order Matters, and end Controverſies among them; to give the Biſhop an Account what Churches ſtood in need of Repairing; to make enquiry by the Biſhop's Order into the State of every Pariſh, and ſee what Condition the Ornaments and Goods of the Church were in, and whether the Eccleſiaſtical Liberties were maintained. *Habertus* thinks [*e*] the Archdeacons were inveſted with the

[*d*] Iſidor. Ep. ad Ludifred. & ap. Gratian. Diſt. 25. c. 1. Sollicitudo quoq; Parochitanorum (al. Parochiarum) & ordinatio, & jurgia ad ejus pertinent curam: Pro reparandis Diœceſanis Baſilicis ipſe ſuggerit Sacerdoti: Ipſe inquirit Parochias cum juſſione Epiſcopi, & Ornamenta, vel res Baſilicarum Parochitanorum (al. Parochiarum) & Libertatum Eccleſiaſticarum Epiſcopo idem refert. [*e*] Habert. in Pontifical. Par. 9. Obſer. 6.

ſame

ſame Power ſome Ages before; and for Proof cites a Paſſage out of the Council of *Chalcedon*, where in an Inſtrument [*f*] preſented by the Presbyters of *Edeſſa* againſt *Ibas* their Biſhop, one *Abramius* a Deacon of that Church, in all the *Latin* Tranſlations is called *Diaconus Apantita*, which *Habertus* takes to be a general Inſpector of the Church. But there are two evident Reaſons againſt this, which it is a wonder ſo obſerving a Perſon as *Habertus* ſhould not ſee: 1. That *Abramius* was not an Archdeacon, but only a private Deacon of the Church: For in the ſame place there is mention made of another Archdeacon, who when *Ibas* was about to have had *Abramius* ordained Biſhop of *Batena*, interpoſed and hindered him from doing it, becauſe he had been cenſured for the Practice of Magick, and never given any Satisfaction to the Church. And though it is ſaid, that *Ibas* took occaſion to remove that Archdeacon from his Office, yet it is not once intimated that he put *Abramius* in his room; which if he had done, it would doubtleſs have been made another Article of Accuſation againſt him before the Council. 2. The Original *Greek* in *Labbè*'s Edition is not διάκονον ἀπαντητὴς, as *Habertus* reads it, but only διάκονον ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἡμετέρης ἐκκλησίας, a Deacon of that our Church of *Edeſſa*: And though ἀπαντητὴς be put into the Margin, yet it is not owned to be any various Reading, but only the Editors Conjecture, which I think is not ſufficient to build ſuch an Aſſertion upon, when no other Proof or Authority is pretended. Therefore I determine nothing concerning this Power of the Archdeacons in ancient Times, but leave it to farther Enquiry, and the Determination of every Judicious Reader.

[*f*] Concil. Chalced. Act. 10. p. 650.

Valeſius

Sect. 10. *Of the Name* Cor-Epiſcopi, *why given to Archdeacons.*

Valeſius takes notice of another Name, which he thinks was ſometimes given to the Archdeacons, that is, the Name *Cor-Epiſcopi*; for which he cites the Words of one *Joannes Abbas* [g], in a Book written about the Tranſlation of the Relicks of St. *Glodeſindis*. This at firſt may look like a Corruption only of the Name *Chorepiſcopus*, becauſe in latter Ages the Power of the ancient *Chorepiſcopi* dwindled into that of the Archdeacons: But when it is conſidered, that all the Deacons anciently were called the Biſhops Eyes, and his Ears, his Mouth, and his Heart, as has been noted in the laſt Chapter, §. 18. It will appear very probable that the Archdeacon ſhould be peculiarly dignified with thoſe Titles; and therefore be called *Cor-Epiſcopi* the Biſhop's Heart, becauſe he was uſed to ſignifie his Mind and Will to the People: As he is called *Oculus Epiſcopi*, not only in ancient Authors [h], but in the Decretals [i], and the Council of *Trent* [k], becauſe he was the Biſhop's Eye to inſpect the Dioceſe under him.

Sect. 11. *The Opinions of Learned Men concerning the firſt Original of the Name and Office of Archdeacon.*

Some may perhaps be deſirous to know farther the firſt Riſe and Original of the Name and Office of Archdeacons in the Church: But this is a Matter involved in ſo great Obſcurity, that it cannot eaſily be determined. *Habertus* and ſome others [l] of the *Roman* Communion, reckon this Office as ancient as that of Deacons themſelves, deriving both from Apoſtolical Conſtitution, and

[g] Joh. Abbas ap. Valeſ. Not. in Theodorit. lib. 1. c. 26. Ad hoc inſpiciendum ſacrorum Miniſtros cum Archidiacono majore, quem Cor-Epiſcopi dicunt, Pontifex direxit. [h] Iſidor. Peluſ. lib. 1. Ep 29. [i] Decretal. lib. 1. Tit. 23. c. 7. [k] Con. Trid. Seſſ. 24. Cap. 12. de Reform. [l] Habert. Not. in Pontifical. p. 207. Baron. an. 34. n. 285.

making

making *Stephen* the first Archdeacon of the Church. But others with greater Reason [*m*], deduce it only from the 3*d*. Century, and leave it as a Matter under Debate and Enquiry, Whether there were any such thing as the Archdeacon's Office in the time of *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, which was in the middle of the 3*d*. Century. This is certain, that *Cornelius* in his Epistle to *Fabius*, where he gives a Catalogue [*n*] of the *Roman* Clergy, though he speaks of Deacons, and Subdeacons, Acolythists, Exorcists, Readers, and Door-keepers, makes no particular mention of the Archdeacon; Nor does *Cyprian* ever so much as once use the Name: Yet before the end of this Century *Cæcilian* is supposed to have had the Title, as well as the Office of Archdeacon of *Carthage*, because *Optatus* calls him so, and the Name often occurs in St. *Jerom* and other Writers of the 4*th* Age, in which St. *Jerom* lived: *Baronius* indeed urges St. *Austin*'s Authority, to prove that *Stephen* was properly an Archdeacon: For he says St. *Austin* calls him *Primicerius Diaconorum*; but he that will look into St. *Austin*, will quickly find his Mistake: For his Words are not *Primicerius Diaconorum*, but *Primicerius* [*o*] *Martyrum*, the Protomartyr, as we commonly call him, because he was the first that suffered for the Name of Christ. And hence the Reader may observe by the way, that the Words *Primicerius* and *Primus* do not always denote Principality, or Priority of Power and Jurisdiction, but only Priority of Time, or Precedency of Honour and Dignity, in respect of Place or outward Order.

[*m*] Bp. Fell Not. in Cypr. Ep 52. al. 49. ad Cornel. [*n*] Cornel. Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. lib. 6. c. 43. [*o*] Aug. Ser. 1. de Sanctis, Tom. 10. Hodie celebramus Natalem, quo Primicerius Martyrum migravit ex mundo.

In which Senſe the ſame St. *Auſtin* [p] ſays in another place, that *Stephen* is named firſt among the Deacons, as *Peter* was among the Apoſtles. Which is a Primacy that may be allowed to them both, without any Pretence of Juriſdiction. *Habertus* urges farther the Authority of the *Greek Menologion*, which gives *Stephen* the Title of Archdeacon: But ſuch Books are not ſufficient Evidence, being they are of a modern Date, and ſpeak of ancient things in the Language and Phraſe of their own Times; for which Reaſon they are not much to be depended on, except when they are backed with the concurrent Teſtimony of ſome ancient Authors, of which there are none in this Caſe to yield any Collateral Evidence to this Aſſertion. Yet on the other hand the Opinion of *Salmaſius* is equally to be diſcarded, who [q] aſſerts that the Office of Archdeacon was not in the Church in the time of St. *Jerom*, though St. *Jerom* [r] himſelf ſays in moſt expreſs Words, that the Cuſtom then was to have one Biſhop, one Archpresbyter, one Archdeacon in every Church. But this is the uſual way of that Author in his Book *de Primatu*, to advance Paradoxes of his own Fancy for ancient Hiſtory, and lay down poſitive Aſſertions upon the moſt ſlender Conjectures, yea, many times againſt the plaineſt Evidence of Primitive Records, as in the Caſe before us, and many others which I have had occaſion to take notice of in this Diſcourſe. It were to be wiſhed, that that Author who wrote upon an uſeful Deſign, had been a little more accurate in his Accounts of the State of the Clergy of the Primitive Church; and whilſt he was demoliſhing the Pope's Supremacy, had not confuſedly treat-

[p] Aug. Ser. 94. de Diverſis. Inter Diaconos illos nominatus Primus, ſicut inter Apoſtolos Petrus. [q] Salmaſ. de Primat. c. 1. p. 8. [r] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Ruſtic. *cited before*, §. 1.

ed

ed of ſome other Orders and Offices, which were of greater Antiquity in the Church.

CHAP. XXII.

Of Deaconeſſes.

Sect. 1. *The ancient Name of Deaconeſſes* Διάκονοι, Πρεσβύτιδες, Viduæ, Miniſtræ.

HAving ſpoken of Deacons and Archdeacons, it remains that I ſay ſomething in this Place of Deaconeſſes, becauſe their Office and Service was of great uſe in the Primitive Church. There is ſome mention made of them in Scripture, by which it appears that their Office was as ancient as the Apoſtolical Age. St. *Paul* calls *Phœbe* a Servant of the Church of *Cenchrea*, *Rom.* 16. 1. The Original Word is Διάκονον, a Deaconeſs, anſwerable to the *Latin* word *Miniſtra*, which is the Name that is given them in *Pliny*'s Epiſtle [*s*], which ſpeaks about the Chriſtians. *Tertullian* [*t*] and ſome others call them *Viduæ*, Widows, and their Office *Viduatus*, becauſe they were commonly choſen out of the Widows of the Church. For the ſame reaſon *Epiphanius* [*u*] and the Council of *Laodicea* [*w*] call them Πρεσβύτιδας, elderly Widows, becauſe none but ſuch were ordinarily taken into this Office.

Sect. 2. *Deaconeſſes to be Widows by ſome Laws.*

For indeed by ſome ancient Laws theſe 4 Qualifications were required in every one, that was to be taken into this Order. 1ſt, That

[*s*] Plin. lib. 10. Ep. 97 Quò magis neceſſarium credidi, ex duabus Ancillis, quæ Miniſtræ dicebantur, quid eſſet veri & per tormenta quærere. [*t*] Tertul. lib. 1. ad Uxor. c. 7. Id. de Veland. Virg. c. 9. Epiph. Hær. 79. n. 4. Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn n. 13. [*u*] Epiphan. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 4. [*w*] Con. Laodic. c. 11.

ſhe

ſhe ſhould be a Widow. 2. That ſhe ſhould be a Widow that had born Children. 3. A Widow that was but once Married. 4. One of a conſiderable Age, Forty, Fifty, or Sixty Years Old. Though all theſe Rules admitted of Exceptions. In *Tertullian*'s time the Deaconeſſes were ſo commonly choſen out of the Widows, that when a certain young Virgin was made a Deaconeſs, he ſpeaks of it [x] as a Miracle or Monſtrous thing in the Church. Yet ſome Learned Men are of Opinion, that Virgins were ſometimes made Deaconeſſes even in the time of *Ignatius*: Becauſe *Ignatius* in his Epiſtle to the Church of *Smyrna* [y], ſalutes the Virgins that were called Widows, that is, Deaconeſſes, as *Cotelerius* and *Voſſius* truly expound it. For Virgins could not be called Widows congruouſly in any other Senſe. Some ſuſpect that the Word *Virgins* is a Corruption crept into the Text: But there is no reaſon for this Conjecture, for *Ignatius* is not the only Author that ſpeaks of Virgin-Deaconeſſes. *Epiphanius* [z] ſays, in his time they were ſome Virgins, and ſome Widows that had been but once Married. The Author of the Conſtitutions [a] ſays the ſame, that the Deaconeſs was either to be a chaſt Virgin, or a Widow that had been the Wife of one Man. And one of *Juſtinian*'s Novels [b] enacted it into a Law, that the Deaconeſſes ſhould be choſen out of one of theſe Orders. Accordingly we find in the Practice of the

[x] Tertul. de Veland. Virgin. c. 9. Scio alicubi Virginem in Viduatu ab annis nondum viginti collocatam. Cui ſi quid refrigerii debuerat Epiſcopus, aliter utiq; ſalvo reſpectu Diſciplinæ, præſtare potuiſſet, ne tale nunc Miraculum, ne dixerim monſtrum, in Eccleſia denotaretur. [y] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 13. Ἀσπάζομαι τὰς παρθένας τὰς λεγομένας χήρας. Coteler. in Loc. Viduæ vocabantur, quia in Gradu Viduali ſeu Diaconico erant conſtitutæ. [z] Epiph. Expoſ. Fid. n. 21. ἢ χηρεύσασαι ἀπὸ μονογαμίας, ἢ ἀεὶ παρθένοι οὖσαι. [a] Conſt. Apoſt. lib. 6 c. 17.

[b] Juſt. Novel. 6. c. 6. Aut Virgines conſtitutas, aut unius viri quæ fuerant Uxores.

Church, Virgins as well as Widows admitted to this Office. *Gregory Nyſſen* [c] ſays, his own Siſter *Macrina*, who was a Virgin, was a Deaconeſs, and ſo was *Lampadia* another Virgin. And *Sozomen* [d] relates, how that *Chryſoſtom* would have ordained *Nicarete* a famous Virgin to this Office, but ſhe refuſed it for the love ſhe had to a Private and Philoſophick Life.

Sect. 3. *And ſuch Widows as had Children.*

Yet by ſome Laws they were required not only to be Widows, but ſuch Widows as had Children alſo. *Tertullian* [e] ſeems to intimate that this was the Cuſtom of the Age he lived in, to put none into this Office but ſuch as were Mothers, and had had the Education of Children, in the Training up of whom they had learnt to be Tender and Compaſſionate in their Affections, and ſo were qualified to aſſiſt others both by their Counſel and Comfort. *Sozomen* alſo mentions a Law [f] made by *Theodoſius* to this purpoſe, That no Women ſhould be admitted to the Office, except they had Children, and were above Sixty Years old, according to the expreſs Rule of St. *Paul*. The Law is ſtill extant in the *Theodoſian* Code [g], in the ſame Words as *Sozomen* cites it: But he ſpeaks of it as a new Law, that was then made upon a particular Occaſion, by reaſon of ſome Scandal that had happened in the Church: Which is a plain Intimation, that from the time of *Tertullian*, to the making of this Law, the Church had varied in her Practice.

[c] Nyſſen. Vit. Macrin. Tom. 2. p. 181, & 197. [d] Sozom. lib. 8. c. 23. [e] Tertul. de Vel. Virg. c. 9. Ad quam Sedem præter annos Sexaginta non tantum Univiræ, id eſt nuptæ, aliquando eliguntur, ſed & Matres & quidem Educatrices filiorum: Scilicet ut experimentis omnium affectuum ſtructæ, facile norint cæteras & conſilio & ſolatio juvare. [f] Sozom. lib. 7. c. 16. Εἰ μὴ παῖδας ἔχοιεν, &c. [g] Cod. Theod. lib. 16. Tit. 2. de Epiſc. & Cler. Leg. 27. Nulla niſi emenſis Sexaginta annis, cui votiva domi Proles ſit, ſecundum præceptum Apoſtoli ad Diaconiſſarum conſortium transferatur.

And

Sect. 4.
Not to be ordained under Sixty Years of Age, by the most ancient Canons.

And so she had likewise with respect to the Age of Deaconesses. For though the forementioned Law of *Theodosius* require them to be Sixty Years of Age Compleat; and *Tertullian* [*h*] and St. *Basil* [*i*] speak of the same Age; yet *Justinian* in one of his Novels [*k*] requires but Fifty, and in another [*l*] but Forty; which is all that was insisted on before by the great [*m*] Council of *Chalcedon*, whose Words are, No Woman shall be ordained a Deaconess before she is Forty Years old. And it is probable in some Cases that Term was not strictly required: For *Sozomen* [*n*] says, *Nectarius* Bishop of *Constantinople* ordained *Olympias* a Deaconess, though she was but a young Widow, because she was a Person of extraordinary Virtue. By which we may judge, that as the Church varied in her Rule about this Matter, so Bishops took a Liberty to ordain Deaconesses at what Age they thought fit, provided they could be assured of their Probity and Virtue.

Sect. 5.
To be such as had been only the Wives of one Man.

But there was another Qualification, which they were more strict in exacting, which was that the Deaconesses should be such Widows as had been only the Wives of one Man, according to the Apostles Prescription, 1 *Tim.* 5. 9. Which Rule they generally understood as a Prohibition of electing any to be Deaco-

[*h*] Tertul. ibid. [*i*] Basil. Ep. Canonic. c. 24. [*k*] Just. Novel. 6. c. 6. Super mediam constitutas ætatem, & circa Quinquaginta annos. [*l*] Novel. 123. c. 13. Diaconissa in sancta Ecclesia non ordinatur, quæ minor Quadraginta annis sit. [*m*] Con. Chalced. c. 14. al. 15. Διάκονον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι γυναῖκα πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα. Vid. Concil. Trullan. c. 14, & 40. [*n*] Sozom. lib. 8. c. 9. Καὶ περὶ νέαν χήραν ὠμολόγην --- διάκονον ἐχειροτόνησε

neſſes, who had been twice Married, though lawfully and ſucceſſively to two Husbands, one after another. In this Senſe *Tertullian* [o] ſays, the Apoſtle requires them to be *Univiræ*, the Wives of one Man; which *Epiphanius* [p] calls χηρίδια τὰς μονογαμίας, Widows that have been but once Married. So the Author of the Conſtitutions, and *Juſtinian*'s Novels [q], which have been cited before.

But *Theodoret* gives a different Senſe of the Apoſtles Words: For he ſuppoſes the Apoſtle not to forbid the chuſing of Widows that had been twice Married, but only ſuch [r] as had Married again after they had divorced themſelves from a former Huſband; which was ſuch a ſcandalous Act, as juſtly excluded them from the Churches Service. And this Senſe is embraced as the moſt probable and rational, by the Learned *Juſtellus* [s], Dr. *Hammond* [t], *Suicerus* [u], and ſeveral others, of which I ſhall have occaſion to give a farther Account, when I come to ſpeak of that Apoſtolical Rule as it concerned all the Clergy. Thus much will ſuffice to be ſpoken at preſent concerning the Qualifications of Deaconeſſes before they were ordained.

Sect. 6.
Whether Deaconeſſes were anciently ordained by Impoſition of Hands.

The next Enquiry is concerning their Ordination it ſelf, Whether it was always performed by Impoſition of Hands? And here Learned Men are very much divided in their Sentiments. *Baronius* [w] thinks they had no Impoſition of Hands at the time

[o] Tertul ad Uxor. lib. 1. c. 7. Viduam allegi in Ordinationem niſi Univiram non concedit. It. de Virg. veland. c. 9.

[p] Epiph. Exp. Fid. n. 21. [q] Juſtin. Novel. 6. c. 6. Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 6. c. 17. [r] Theod. Com. in 1 Tim. 5. 9. [s] Juſtel. Not. ad Can 1. Concil. Laodic. [t] Ham. Annot. on 1 Tim. 3. 2. [u] Suicer Theſaur. Tom. 1. p. 899. [w] Baron. an. 34. n. 23. It. Cabaſſut. Notit. Concil. c 56. p. 342.

of

of the Council of *Nice*, and he grounds his Aſſertion upon one of the Canons of that Council, which, as he expounds it, denies that Deaconeſſes were ordained by Impoſition of Hands, and therefore makes no other account of them than as mere Lay-Perſons. *Valeſius* [x] gives the ſame Expoſition of the Canon; though he owns that *Balſamon* and *Zonaras*, the ancient Expoſitors, were of a contrary Judgment, *viz.* That the Canon ſpeaks not of the Deaconeſſes of the Church, but of ſuch as returned to the Catholick Church from the *Paulianiſts* or *Samoſatenian* Hereticks, among whom they had received no Impoſition of Hands, and therefore were to be treated as mere *Laicks*. And in this Senſe *Suicerus* [y], and *Albaſpiny* [z], *Chriſtianus Lupus*, *Fabrotus*, and other modern Criticks and Expoſitors of the Canon explain it alſo. To make the Reader himſelf judge in the Matter, I muſt here recite the Words of the Canon, which are theſe: Concerning the *Paulianiſts* which return to the Catholick Church, it is decreed, that they ſhall be by all means Re-baptized. And if any of them were heretofore reckoned among the Clergy, if they appear to be blameleſs, and without Rebuke, let them be firſt Baptized, and then ordained by the Biſhop of the Catholick Church: But if upon Examination they be found unfit, let them be depoſed. The ſame Rule ſhall be obſerved concerning Deaconeſſes, and all others who are reckoned among their Clergy. And we particularly take notice [a] of Deaconeſſes, which appear in that

[x] Valeſ. Not. in Sozomen. lib. 8. c. 9. [y] Suicer. Theſaur. Tom. 1. p. 867. [z] Albaſp. Not. in Can. 19. Concil. Nicen. Lupus Tom. 1. Schol. in eund. Can. Fabrot. Not. ad Balſamon. Collect. Conſtitut. p. 1417. [a] Con. Nic. c. 19. Ἐμνήσθημεν ἢ τ διακονισσῶν τ ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἐξεταθεισῶν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ χειροθεσίαν τινὰ ἔχουσιν, ὥστε ἐξάπαντος ἐν τοῖς λαικοῖς αὐτὰς ἐξετάζεσθαι.

Habit or Dignity, that having never had any Impoſition of Hands, they are to be reckoned only among the Laity. Theſe laſt Words about Deaconeſſes ſeem to refer to what goes before; and then they muſt be interpreted of Deaconeſſes among the *Paulianiſts*, who took upon them the Habit of Deaconeſſes without any Conſecration. Or if we underſtand them as ſpoken of Deaconeſſes already in the Church, they may mean that there were ſome Deaconeſſes which had crept into the Office without Impoſition of Hands, and ſuch the Council accounts no more than Lay Perſons. That which will incline a Man to interpret this Canon to ſome ſuch Senſe as this, is, That all other Councils and Writers ſpeak of ordaining Deaconeſſes by Impoſition of Hands. *Valeſius* himſelf owns that it was ſo in the time of the Council of *Chalcedon*; for in one of the Canons of that Council [*b*] their Ordination is expreſly called both χειροτονία and χειροθεσία, Ordination by Impoſition of Hands. And the Author of the Conſtitutions [*c*] ſpeaking of their Ordination, requires the Biſhop to uſe Impoſition of Hands, with a Form of Prayer, which is there recited. And thus it was both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, ſo long as the Order it ſelf continued to be in uſe. The Council of *Trullo*, *An.* 692. ſpeaks of their Ordination in two Canons [*d*] under the Name of χειροτονία. And *Sozomen* [*e*] uſes the ſame Word in ſpeaking of the Ordination of *Olympias*. And though there be not ſo many Examples of this Practice to be met with in the *Latin* Church, becauſe the Order was there much ſooner laid aſide: Yet *Cotelerius* [*f*] has furniſhed us with

[*b*] Con. Chalced. c. 15. [*c*] Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 19. ὁ ἐπίσκοπε, ἐπιθήσεις αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας, &c. [*d*] Con. Trull. c. 14, & 40. [*e*] Sozom. lib. 8. c. 9. [*f*] Coteler. Not. in Conſt. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 19. Con. Wormatienſ. c. 73. ex Concil. Chalced. c. 15.

ſome

ſome out of *Fortunatus* and the Council of *Worms*, both which expreſly ſay, the Ordination of Deaconeſſes was performed by Impoſition of Hands. In the Council of *Worms* the 15th Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon* is repeated. And *Fortunatus* his words are, *Manu ſuperpoſita* [g] *conſecravit Diaconam*, ſpeaking of one whom *Medardus* the Biſhop conſecrated a Deaconeſs, by laying his Hands upon her. All which ſhews, that it was the conſtant Practice of the Church to ordain Deaconeſſes by Impoſition of Hands: And that makes it very probable, that the *Nicene* Canon is to be underſtood in that Senſe, which is moſt agreeable to the Churches Practice.

But the Learned *Juſtellus* [b] ſtill raiſes another Scruple about their Ordination: He thinks this Impoſition of Hands was not properly an Ordination, but only a Benediction: For he diſtinguiſhes betwixt thoſe two things, and ſays, every ſolemn Impoſition of Hands is not an Ordination; which is very true; for then the Impoſition of Hands upon the *Catechumens*, or upon the Baptized in Confirmation, or upon the Penitents in order to reconcile them, or upon the Sick in order to their Cure, or upon any Perſons whatſoever to give them a common Benediction, would be an Ordination: But then that Learned Perſon ſeems not to have conſidered, that the Impoſition of Hands upon the Deaconeſſes was ſomething more than all theſe: For it was a Conſecration of them to a certain Office in the Church, which ſort of Impoſition of Hands joined with a Prayer of Benediction for Grace to diſcharge that Office aright, is what the Church has always meant and called particularly by the Name of Ordination.

[g] Fortun. Vit. Radegundis ap. Surium. Aug. 13. [b] Juſtel. Bibl. Jur. Canon. T. 1. p. 75. Not. in Con. Nic. c. 19.

Sect. 7. *Not consecrated to any Office of the Priesthood.*

Yet we are not to imagine, that this Consecration gave them any Power to execute any part of the *Sacerdotal* Office, or do the Duties of the sacred Function. Women were always forbidden to perform any such Offices as those. Therefore the Author of the Constitutions calls it a Heathenish Practice to ordain Women-Priests, ἱερείας χειροτονεῖν: For the Christian [*i*] Law allowed no such Custom. Some Hereticks indeed as [*k*] *Tertullian* observes, allowed Women to Teach, and Exorcise, and administer Baptism; but all this, he says, was against the Rule [*l*] of the Apostle. *Epiphanius* brings the Charge particularly against the *Pepuzians*, which were a Branch of the *Montanists*, that they [*m*] made Women-Bishops and Women-Presbyters, abusing that Passage of the Apostle, *In Christ Jesus there is neither Male nor Female*, to put some Colour upon their Practice. He charges it also upon the *Collyridians* [*n*], that they did ἱερουργεῖν διὰ γυναικῶν, use Women to Sacrifice to the Virgin *Mary*. Where it is observed that the Charge is double, 1. That they gave Divine Worship to the Holy Virgin, and 2. That they used Women-Priests in their Service. Against these he has a particular Dissertation, wherein he shews at large that no Woman from the Foundation of the World was ever ordained to offer Sacrifice, or perform any solemn Ser-

[*i*] Constit. Apost. lib. 3. c 9. [*k*] Tertul. de Præscript. c. 41. Ipsæ mulieres hæreticæ quam procaces, quæ audeant docere, contendere, Exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, forsitan & tingere. [*l*] Id. c. 17. de Baptismo.

[*m*] Epiph Hær. 49. Pepuzian. n. 2. ἐπίσκοποι παρ' αὐτοῖς γυναῖκες, καὶ πρεσβύτεραι γυναῖκες. [*n*] Id. Hær. 78. Antidicomarianit. n. 23.

vice

vice [o] of the Church: Which if it had been allowed to any, would certainly have been granted to the Virgin *Mary* her ſelf, who was ſo highly favoured of God. But neither ſhe nor any other Woman had ever the Prieſt's Office committed to them. There is indeed, ſays he, an Order of Deaconeſſes in the Church, but their buſineſs [p] is not to Sacrifice, or perform any part of the *Sacerdotal* Office, or any of the ſacred Myſteries, but to be a decent Help to the Female Sex in the time of their Baptiſm, Sickneſs, Affliction, or the like: And therefore he denies, that the Church made them either Presbytereſſes or Prieſteſſes, ἢ πρεσβυτείδας, ἢ ἱερείας. Where the Reader is to obſerve, that *Epiphanius* puts a Diſtinction betwixt the Names πρεσβύτιδας and πρεσβυτείδας, becauſe the former only denotes Elderly Women, ſuch as the Deaconeſſes commonly were; but the latter he uſes to ſignify Perſons ordained to the Office of Presbyters or Prieſts, which he abſolutely denies any Women in the Chriſtian Church to be.

Sect 8. *Their Offices, 1. To aſſiſt at the Baptiſm of Women.*

And from hence it is plain the Offices of the Deaconeſſes were only to perform ſome Inferior Services of the Church, and thoſe chiefly relating to the Women, for whoſe ſake they were ordained. One part of their Office was to aſſiſt the Miniſter at the Baptizing of Women, where for Decencies ſake they were employed to diveſt them (the Cuſtom then being to baptize all Adult Perſons by Immerſion) and ſo to order the Matter, that the whole Ceremony

[o] Id. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 3. Εἰ ἱερατεύειν γυναῖκες Θεῷ προσετάσσοντο, ἢ κανονικὸν τὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἔδει μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ἢ Μαρίαν ἱερατείαν ἐπιτελέσαι, &c. [p] Ibid. Διακονιῶν πάγμα ἔστιν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερατεύειν, οὐδὲ τὶ ἐπιχειρεῖν ἐπιτρέπειν.

might

might be performed with all the Decency becoming ſo ſacred an Action. This is evident from *Epiphanius* both in the forecited Paſſage, and other [*a*] Places. And it is taken notice of alſo by *Juſtinian* [*b*] and the Author [*c*] of the Conſtitutions, who adds, that the Deaconeſſes were uſed to anoint the Women in Baptiſm with the Holy Oil, as the Cuſtom of the *Greek* Church then was, not only for the Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, but alſo for the Deaconeſſes to uſe this Ceremony of Unction before Baptiſm; of which *Cotelerius* in his Notes [*d*] gives ſeveral Inſtances out of the ancient Writers, but theſe belong to another place.

Sect. 9.

2. To be a ſort of Private Catechiſts to the Women-Catechumens.

2. Another Part of their Office was to be a ſort of Private Catechiſts to the Women-Catechumens, who were preparing for Baptiſm. For though they were not allowed to teach Publickly in the Church, yet they might Privately inſtruct and teach thoſe, how to make the proper Anſwers that were required of all Perſons at their Baptiſm. The Author of the ſhort Notes on the Epiſtles [*e*] under the Name of St. *Jerom*, calls this, Private Miniſtery of the Word, which the Deaconeſſes performed in the Eaſtern Churches in his Time. And it was ſo uſual and ordinary a Part of their Office in the *African* Churches, that the Fathers of the Fourth Council of *Carthage* [*f*] require

[*a*] Epiph. Expoſ. Fid. 21. [*b*] Juſtin Novel. 6. c. 6. [*c*] Conſt. Apoſt. Lib 3. c. 15. [*d*] Coteler. in Loc.

[*e*] Hieron. Com. in Rom. 16. 1. Sicut etiam nunc in Orientalibus Diaconiſſæ mulieres, in ſuo Sexu miniſtrare videntur in Baptiſmo, ſive in Miniſterio Verbi, quia privatim docuiſſe Fœminas invenimus, &c. [*f*] Con. Carthag. 4. c. 12. Viduæ vel Sanctimoniales, quæ ad miniſterium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam inſtructæ ſint ad Officium, ut poſſint apto & ſano Sermone docere imperitas & ruſticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ ſunt, qualiter Baptizatori interrogatæ reſpondeant, & qualiter, accepto baptiſmate, vivant.

it

it as a neceſſary Qualification in Deaconeſſes when they are ordained, that they ſhall be Perſons of ſuch good Underſtanding, as to be able to inſtruct the Ignorant and Ruſtick Women, how to make Reſponſes to the Interrogatories, which the Miniſter puts to them in Baptiſm, and how they were to order their Converſation afterward.

Sect. 10.
3. To viſit and attend Women that were ſick and in diſtreſs.

3. Another Part of their Employment was to viſit and attend Women that were ſick, which is noted by *Epiphanius* [g] and the Author of the Conſtitutions, who [h] ſays they were employed likewiſe in delivering the Biſhop's Meſſages and Directions to Women that were in Health, whom the Deacons could not viſit becauſe of Unbelievers: That is, becauſe of the Scandal and Reproach which the Heathens were ready to caſt upon them.

Sect. 11.
4. To miniſter to the Martyrs and Confeſſors in Priſon.

4. In Times of Danger and Perſecution they were employed in Miniſtring to the Martyrs in Priſon, becauſe they could more eaſily gain Acceſs to them, and go with leſs Suſpicion, and leſs Danger and Hazard of their Lives from the Heathen, than the Deacons or any other Miniſters of the Church could do. *Cotelerius* [i] and *Gothofred* collect this from ſome Paſſages in *Lucian* and *Libanius*, which ſeem plainly to refer to this Part of the Deaconeſſes Miniſtry. For *Lucian* in one of his Dialogues ſpeaking of *Peregrine* the Philoſopher, how he was careſſed by the Chriſtians, whilſt he was in Priſon for the Profeſſion

[g] Epiph. Hær. 79. n. 3. Expoſ. Fid. n. 21.

[h] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 3. c. 15. & 19. Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepot. Multas Anus alit Eccleſia quæ Officium ægrotanti præſtant, &c. [i] Coteler. Not. in Conſt. Lib. 3. c. 15. Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Theodoſ. Lib. 16. Tit. 2. Leg. 27.

of

of their Religion, ſays, In the Morning one might obſerve the old Women the Widows waiting at the Priſon Gate [k] with ſome of the Orphan Children: Where by the Widows he doubtleſs means the Deaconeſſes of the Chriſtians. And there is little Queſtion but *Libanius* [l] means the ſame, when he ſays, that the Mother or Miſtreſs of the old Women, when ſhe finds any one bound in Priſon, runs about, and begs and makes a Collection for him. This plainly refers to the great Charity and Liberality of the Chriſtians toward their Martyrs, which was collected and ſent to them by the Hand of theſe Deaconeſſes.

Sect. 12.

5. To attend the Womens-Gate in the Church.

5. In the *Greek* Churches the Deaconeſſes had alſo the Charge of the Doors of the Church, which Part of their Office is mentioned by the Author [m] of the Conſtitutions, and the Author under the Name of *Ignatius*, who [n] ſtiles them Φρυξὲς τῶν ἁγίων πυλώνων, the Keepers of the Holy Gates. But probably this was only in ſuch Churches as made a Diſtinction betwixt the Men's Gate and the Women's Gate: For Bp. *Uſher* obſerves, [o] that no ancient Writers beſide theſe two make any mention of this, as part of the Office of Deaconeſſes: And in another place of the Conſtitutions [p] this Diſtinction is plainly expreſſed: Let the Door-keepers ſtand at the Gate of the Men, and the Deaconeſſes at the Gate of the Women.

[k] Lucian. Peregrin. Παρὰ τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ περιμένοντα γεραίδια, χήρας πινὰς, &c.

[l] Liban. Orat. 16. in Teſtamen. It. Orat. de Vinctis, *cited by* Gothofred.

[m] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 8. c. 28.

[n] Pſeudo-Ignat. Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12.

[o] Uſſer. Diſſert. 17. in Ignat. p. 224.

[p] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. 2. c. 57.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, they were to aſſign all Women their Places, and regulate [q] their Behaviour in the Church; to preſide over the reſt of the Widows; [r] whence in ſome Canons they are ſtiled Προεδρίδες, Governeſſes; as *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* note upon the Council [s] of *Laodicea*: and if any Woman had any Suit to prefer to a Deacon or a Biſhop, a Deaconeſs [t] was to introduce her. Theſe were the Offices of the Deaconeſſes in the Primitive Church, which I have been a little more particular in deſcribing, becauſe they are not now ſo commonly known; the Order it ſelf having been for ſome Ages wholly laid aſide.

Sect. 13. *6. To preſide over the Widows, &c.*

If it be enquired, How long this Order continued in the Church, and what time it was totally aboliſhed? I anſwer, It was not laid aſide every where at once, but continued in the *Greek* Church longer than in the *Latin*, and in ſome of the *Latin* Churches longer than in others. In the *Greek* Church they continued to the Time of *Balſamon*, that is, to the latter end of the Twelfth Century; for he ſpeaks of them [u] as then Miniſtring in the Church of *Conſtantinople*: Though it appears from ſome other Paſſages of the ſame Author that in other Churches [x] they were generally laid aſide. In the *Latin* Church there were ſome Decrees made againſt their Ordination long before. For the Firſt Council of *Orange*, *An.* 441, forbids [y] any more Deaconeſſes

Sect. 14. *How long this Order continued in the Church.*

[q] Conſtit. Lib. 2. c. 58. [r] Ibid. Lib. 3. c. 7.
[s] Con. Laodic. c. 11. [t] Conſtit. Lib. 2. c. 26.
[u] Balſam. Reſp ad Interrog. Marci. c. 35. ap. Leunclav. Jus Gr. Rom. T. 1. p. 381. [x] Id. Com. in Concil. Chalced. c. 15. [y] Conc. Araſic. . . c. 26. Diaconiſſæ omnimodæ non ordinandæ, &c.

to

to be ordained. And the Council of *Epone* [z] *An.* 517, has a Canon to the ſame purpoſe, wholly abrogating their Conſecration. Not long after which, the Second Council of *Orleans*, *An.* 533, renewed the Decree [a] againſt them. And before any of theſe, the Council of *Laodicea* in the *Eaſtern* Church had forbidden them under the Name of ancient Widows or Governeſſes, decreeing [b] that no ſuch for the future ſhould be conſtituted in the Church. But theſe Decrees had no Effect at all in the Eaſt, nor did they univerſally take Effect in the Weſt till many Ages after. The Author indeed under the Name of St. *Ambroſe*, would lead an unwary Reader into a great Miſtake: for he makes as if the Order of Deaconeſſes was no where uſed [c] but among the *Montaniſts*; ignorantly confounding the Presbytereſſes of the *Montaniſts* with the Deaconeſſes of the Church. And the Author under the Name of St. *Jerom* is not much more to be regarded, when he ſeems to intimate that in his Time the Order of Deaconeſſes was wholly laid aſide in the *Weſt*, and only retained [d] in the Oriental Churches. For I have already ſhewed (§. 6.) from *Venantius Fortunatus*, who lived *An.* 560. and the Council of *Worms*, which was held in the 9*th* Century, that Deaconeſſes were ſtill retained in ſome parts of the *Weſtern* Church; which may be evinced alſo from the *Ordo Romanus* [e], and other Rituals in uſe about that time, where among other Forms we meet with an *Ordo ad Dia-*

[z] Conc. Epauneſ. c. 21. Viduarum conſecrationem, quas Diaconiſſas vocant, ab omni religione noſtra penitus abrogamus.

[a] Conc. Aurel. 2. c. 17. Placuit ut nulli poſtmodum Fœminæ Diaconalis Benedictio pro conditionis hujus fragilitate credatur. [b] Conc. Laodic. c. 11. Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρεσβύτιδας ἤτοι πρεσκαθημένας ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ καθίζειν. [c] Ambroſ. Com. in 1 Tim. 3. 11. [d] Hieron. Com. in Rom. 16. 1. *and in* 1 Tim. 3. 11. [e] Ordo Roman. p. 161, in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 9. Par. 1624.

conam

conam faciendam, An Order or Form to conſecrate a Deaconeſs. But in an Age or two after, that is, in the Tenth or Eleventh Century, *Bona* [*f*] thinks the whole Order was quite extinct.

Sect. 15. *Another Notion of the Name* Diaconiſſa, *as it ſignifies a Deacon's Wife.*

Before I make an end of this Subject, I cannot but acquaint the Reader, that there is another Notion of the Name *Diaconiſſa*, ſometimes to be met with in the Writers of the middle Ages of the Church, who uſe it to ſignify not a Deaconeſs, but a Deacon's Wife, in the ſame Senſe as *Presbytera* ſignifies the Wife of a Presbyter, and *Epiſcopa* the Wife of a Biſhop. The Word *Epiſcopa* is thus uſed in the 2d Council of *Tours*, where it is ſaid, That if a Biſhop have not a Wife [*g*], there ſhall no train of Women follow him. So alſo the Words *Presbytera*, *Diaconiſſa*, and *Subdiaconiſſa* [*h*] for the Wives of a Presbyter, a Deacon, and a Subdeacon, occur a little after in the ſame Council. And ſo in the Council of *Auxerre* [*i*] and ſome other places. From which a Learned and Ingenious Examiner [*k*] of the Council of *Trent* concludes, that Biſhops in thoſe times were not as yet obliged by the Law of Cœlibacy, not to cohabit with their Wives, in the *Gallican* Church. But I ſhall freely own, I take this to be a Miſtake; For from the Time of Pope *Siricius* the Cœlibacy of the Clergy began to be preſſed in the *Weſtern* Church, and theſe very Canons do enforce it: Therefore I lay no greater Streſs upon them than they will bear: For as for the Cauſe of the

[*f*] Bona Rer. Liturg. lib. 1. c. 25. n. 15. [*g*] Con. Turon. 2. c. 14. Epiſcopum Epiſcopam non habentem, nulla ſequatur turba Mulierum. [*h*] Ibid. c. 20. Si inventus fuerit Presbyter cum ſua Presbytera, aut Diaconus cum ſua Diaconiſſa, aut Subdiaconus cum ſua Subdiaconiſſa, annum integrum excommunicatus habeatur. [*i*] Con. Antiſſidor. c. 21. [*k*] Gentillet. Exam. Concil. Trid. lib. 4. p. 259.

Mar-

Married Clergy, it needs not be defended by ſuch Arguments, having the Rule and Practice of the Whole Catholick Church, for ſome of the pureſt Ages, to abet and ſupport it; of which I ſhall give a juſt account hereafter, when I come to conſider the general Qualifications that were neceſſarily required of the Clergy of the Primitive Church, among which the Vow of Cœlibacy will be found to have no Place. What therefore theſe Canons mean by *Epiſcopa* and *Presbytera*, is no more than the Wife of a Biſhop or Presbyter, which they had before they were ordained, but in thoſe declining Ages of the Church were not allowed to cohabit with them after Ordination. This Explication agrees both with the Scope of thoſe Canons, and the Practice of the Times they were made in; and we have no Diſpute with *Antonius Auguſtinus* [*l*], or any candid Writer of the *Romiſh* Communion, who carry this Notion no higher than the Ages in which it was broached: But when *Baronius* [*m*] and others transfer it to the Primitive Ages, and make the Practice of the *Weſtern* Church in the ſixth Age to be the Practice of the Univerſal Church in all Ages, they manifeſtly Prevaricate, and put a Fallacy upon their Readers, which it may be ſufficient to have hinted here, and ſhall be more fully made out in its proper Place.

[*l*] Anton. Aug. de Emendat. Gratiani lib. 1. Dial. 20. p. 226.
[*m*] Baron. an. 58. n. 18.

Sold by R. Knaplock.
The Clergyman's *Vade Mecum*. 2 Vol.

F I N I S.